REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 946 JC 660 001

A CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AFFECTING CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES.

CALIFORNIA STATE COORD. COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUC.

REPORT NUMBER CCHE-1018 PUB DATE APR 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.00 75P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, SCHOOL REDISTRICTING, *EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, STATE AID, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS, *PERSONNEL, FACULTY, STUDENTS, CURRICULUM, COLLEGE ADMISSION, SAN FRANCISCO

IMPORTANT PROBLEMS EXIST IN RESPECT TO OBJECTIVES, DISTRICTING AND GOVERNANCE. FINANCIAL SUPPORT, STUDENTS AND STAFF OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES. CONTINUATION OF THE "OPEN DOOR" POLICY, WITH PROVISION FOR A WIDE RANGE OF STUDENT ABILITIES AND GOALS, IS URGED. ALL TERRITORY IN THE STATE SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS, JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION SHOULD BE SEPARATED FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS WITHOUT REDUCING ARTICULATION WITH THEM. PENDING A STUDY OF GOVERNANCE AT THE STATE LEVEL, THE PRESENT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD REORGANIZE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE, ADMISSION, PROBATION, AND RETENTION STANDARDS NEED STUDY. FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM THE STATE SHOULD BE INCREASED, BOTH IN EQUALIZATION AND BASIC AID, AND THE VARIATION IN SUPPORT FOR ATTENDANCE OF MINORS AND ADULTS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED. A STATE BOARD FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES IS CONSIDERED AND MODELS ARE OUTLINED. DETAILS OF EACH OF THE PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE PRESENTED, AND REFERENCES AND EXTRACTS FROM PERTINENT DOCUMENTS AND LEGISLATION, AND TABLES AND FORMULAS ARE INCLUDED. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED010946

COORDINATING
CALIFORNIA'S
HIGHER
EDUCATION

A CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AFFECTING CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 22 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Number 1018
April 1965

COORDINATING
COUNCIL FOR
HIGHER
EDUCATION

JC 660 001

The Council is composed of fifteen members representing the various segments of higher education and the general public.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Representing the General Public:

WARREN M. CHRISTOPHER, Los Angeles, President of the Council
ANDREW F. KAY, Del Mar
BERT W. LEVIT, San Francisco

Representing the Private Colleges and Universities:

FATHER CHARLES S. CASASSA, President, Loyola University of Los Angeles

DR. ARTHUR G. COONS, President, Occidental College, and Vice President of the Council

DR. ROBERT WERT, Vice Provost, Stanford University

Representing the Public Junior Colleges:

MRS. ELEANORE D. NETTLE, Trustee of the College of San Mateo
WILLIAM A. NORRIS, Member State Board of Education
STUART M. WHITE, Superintendent, State Center Junior College District

Representing the California State Colleges:

DR. GLENN S. DUMKE, Chancellor of the State Colleges
LOUIS H. HEILBRON, Trustee
CHARLES LUCKMAN, Chairman of the Board of Trustees

Representing the University of California:

EDWARD W. CARTER, Chairman of the Board of Regents
DR. CLARK KERR, President of the University
DR. DONALD H. McLAUGHLIN, Regent

COUNCIL STAFF

WILLARD B. SPALDING, Director
RUSSELL W. BARTHELL, Associate Director—Finance and Facilities
KEITH SEXTON, Project Coordinator and Assistant to the Council
JOHN M. SMART, Assistant Director
COURTLAND L. WASHBURN, Fiscal Specialist
J. CLAUDE SCHEUERMAN, Fiscal Specialist
FRANKLIN G. MATSLER, Facilities and Planning Specialist
SIDNEY W. BROSSMAN, Educational Programs Specialist
FRANKLIN V. THOMAS, Research Associate
BERT K. SIMPSON, Research Assistant

A CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AFFECTING CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

A REPORT OF THE COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Sacramento and San Francisco
April 1965

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

PREFACE

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education since its organization in October 1960 has assumed a greater responsibility toward the California public Junior Colleges than for either of the two, four-year segments of public higher education. To date the Junior Colleges have not had an organization at the State level, such as that available to the California State Colleges or the University of California, which is able to speak with a single voice on the many subjects of concern to California Junior Colleges. It is for this reason that the Council and its staff have assumed a special task in assisting to coordinate the development of Junior Colleges throughout the state under the general provisions of the Master Plan for Higher Education as approved in December of 1959.

The following report is an effort to highlight several of the important problems affecting the Junior Colleges: problems which involve, for the most part, major policy decisions at the highest levels of government. Prepared with the assistance of several Junior College experts, the report first sets forth an extensive statement of the status of the Junior Colleges today. It then presents in greater detail the subjects of Junior College district organization and statewide governance and the financing programs necessary to meet the demands for Junior College programs. The report then presents the advisory statements of a Council-sponsored seminar whose membership included knowledgeable persons on all aspects of the Junior Colleges. The work-papers prepared for that seminar constitute the core about which this report has been developed.

Recommendations of the Council conclude the report. A reading of these statements will indicate the tasks before the Council and its staff for further study and reporting, specifically in the areas of governance and finance. These studies are going forward at the present time and report of their findings will supplement the information contained herein.

The Council and its staff are grateful for the assistance of those persons participating in the seminar program. Special appreciation must also be accorded Dr. Dale Tillery who prepared Section I of the report and to Drs. John Lombardi, Henry Tyler, and Leland Medsker who prepared the basic documentation upon which Sections II and III are based.

A final acknowledgment must be made. And that is recognition of the efforts of Dr. John R. Richards, Director of the Council from September 1961 until February 1965 and now Vice President of the Institute for International Education. Dr. Richards played a primary role in the preparing of initial drafts of this report indicating his very special concern with the growth of Junior Colleges in California.

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
PREFACE 3
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 9

SECTION I CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

- The Issues 11
- Implications of the Past 12
  - Who Shall be Taught 12
  - What is the Junior College Role 12
  - How Shall California Junior Colleges be Governed 13
  - Who Will Pay the Bill 14
- The Big Shift to Junior Colleges 14
  - Distribution of Colleges 15
  - Flow of Students 15
  - Summary 15
- Junior College Students 16
  - Ability and Prior Performance 16
  - Family Background 17
  - Educational and Vocational Aspirations 17
  - Persistence and Achievement in College 18
- What is to be Taught 20
  - Preparation for Transfer 20
  - Preparation for Employment 21
  - Education for Life 22
  - Education for Adults 23
  - Remedial Education 24
  - The Redefinition of Higher Education 24
- Governance of Junior Colleges: Changes and Challenges 25
  - Junior College Districts in Transition 25
  - The Sharing of Authority 26
  - State Direction and Supervision 27
  - The Role of Associations 29
  - Alternatives to the Status Quo 30
  - Questions to be Answered 32
- The Faculties and Their Standards 33
  - The Teaching Faculties 33
  - Teaching Conditions 34
  - The Problem of Certification 35
  - Administrative Personnel 36
  - Junior College Service Personnel 37
  - The Problem of Standards 37

SECTION II SEPARATION OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGES FROM THE SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTEM AND FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGES 39

- Separation from Secondary Schools 39
  - Governance of Local Districts 39
  - The Development of Higher Education in Junior Colleges 40
  - Problems Evolving from Separating Junior Colleges from Secondary School Systems 40
- Governance of Junior Colleges at the State Level 45
  - Other States 45
  - California 45

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

Page

SECTION III THE FINANCE OF CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES 50
- Support for Junior College Operational Expenditures 50
  - Recommended Level of Support in the Master Plan 50
  - Projecting the Current Expense for Education and the State Support Required by Master Plan Recommendations 50
  - The Current Support Program 51
  - Advantages and Disadvantages of the Current Support Program 55
  - Increasing State Assistance Within the Current Support Program 56
  - Method of Support in Other States 56
  - Alternatives to the Current Program of Support 56
  - Issues to be Faced in the Determination of a Support Program 58
  - Proposed Changes in Junior College Financial Support for 1965–66 59
- Support for Junior College Capital Outlay:
  - Recent Developments 60

SECTION IV CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 64
- Advice to the Council 64
  - Junior College Objectives 64
  - Junior College Districts and Relationship to Public Schools 64
  - Governance of Junior Colleges 64
  - Junior College Finance 64
  - Preparation and Certification of Professional Staff 65
- Council Comments and Recommendations 65
  - Governance of Local Districts 65
  - The Development of Higher Education in Junior Colleges 65
  - Support for Current Operations 67
  - Support for Capital Outlay 68
  - Diversion of Lower Division Students to Junior Colleges 69
  - Universal Junior College Districts 69
  - Governance of Junior Colleges at the State Level 69

APPENDIX

Participants, Seminar on Issues Affecting the Junior Colleges 73

Table I—Junior College "Tuition Tax" by Counties 1959–60 to 1963–64 74

Table II—Assessed Valuation Per Resident Non-Adult Unit of ADA, All Junior Colleges, 1961–62 and 1963–64 75

TABLES IN TEXT

SECTION I

- Table 1 Full-Time Enrollments in California Higher Education 14
- Table 2 Projected Full and Part-Time Enrollments in California Junior Colleges 14
- Table 3 Percentage of 1961 Graduates of California Public High Schools Who Entered Institutions of Higher Education 16
- Table 4 Persistence of 952 Students Enrolled in 1961 in a California Junior College 18
- Table 5 Junior College Transfers to the University of California 1950–1962 19
- Table 6 Junior College Transfers to the California State College System 1957–1962 19

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TABLES IN TEXT—Continued

Page
Table 7 First Semester Transfer Records of Selected Institutions by Junior College Students in 1960 ____ 19
Table 8 Grade Point Differentials of Junior College Transfers at Selected Four-Year Institutions ____ 20
Table 9 Changing Patterns of Junior Colleges District Reorganization _ 26
Table 10 Institutions of Prior Appointment for California Junior College 1957–58 to 1961–62 ____ 33
Table 11 Credentials Earned by New Junior College Teachers Employed in 1961–62 ____ 34
Table 12 Distribution of New Faculty by Instructional Areas in California Junior Colleges 1957–58 to 1961–62 ____ 34
Table 13 Probation Standards of California Junior Colleges ____ 38

SECTION III

Table 14 Current Expense of Education, Apportionment from the State School Fund, and Apportionment from the State School Fund as a Percent of the Current Expense of Education Both Actual and as Recommended by the Master Plan (1954 through 1964) ____ 51
Table 15 Actual and Projected Current Expenditures of Education for Public Junior Colleges—1961–62 to 1975–76 ____ 52
Table 16 Actual and Projected State and Local Shares of the Current Expenditure of Education for Public Junior Colleges, 1961–62 to 1975–76 ____ 52
Table 17 Average Property Tax Rate Required to Fund Local Share of Actual and Projected Current Expense of Education California Public Junior Colleges 1961–62 to 1975–76 ____ 53
Table 18 Number of Districts, By Type, Maintaining Junior Colleges ___ 55

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education on February 23, 1965, approved the following recommendations concerning California public Junior Colleges:

1. The Council advise the 1965 Legislature to separate all Junior Colleges from unified or high school districts. This action is taken recognizing certain legal considerations in instances of charter cities.
2. The State Committee on Continuing Education[1] be directed to study and report periodically to the Council concerning problems of overlap in programs of retraining or in other vocational programs offered in continuing education.
3. The Council endorse the Junior College goal of serving all who are now legally eligible to enroll.
4. A representative technical committee be established to advise the staff in a study in depth of the financing of the Junior Colleges through the current support program and alternate programs and report back to the Council prior to the 1967 session of the Legislature.
5. The Council advise the 1965 Legislature that the definition of an adult, as found in Section 6352 of the *Education Code,* be eliminated and State financial support for the Junior Colleges be provided according to graded and ungraded classes rather than upon the category of students enrolled in the classes.
6. The Council support the proposed Junior College Construction Act developed by the committee established under the provisions of Section 2, Chapter 1790, Statutes of 1963 (Senate Bill 1515) as submitted by the State Department of Education to the Legislature on January 11, 1965.
7. The Council advise the 1965 Legislature that all areas of the State be placed immediately in Junior College districts and that sparsely populated districts be encouraged to provide residence halls for students.

On March 30, 1965, the Council approved the following resolution relative to Junior College statewide governance:

WHEREAS, Enrollments in California Junior Colleges will increase dramatically from the present 172,150 to 300,450 full-time students by 1980, and the number of Junior Colleges is projected to increase from the current 74 campuses to over 100 by 1980; and

WHEREAS, The need to provide more statewide staff assistance and services for Junior Colleges is already becoming increasingly necessary, and there is an urgent and increased need for leadership at the State level devoted solely to the problems, interests and development of the Junior Colleges; and now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in recognition of the major role of the Junior Colleges in public higher education in California, states that it believes the ultimate establishment of a statewide board devoted exclusively to the Junior Colleges may be essential to the future orderly growth and development not only of the Junior Colleges, but to all of California higher education; and be it further

Resolved, That the staff of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education is directed to immediately begin an intensive study of:

1. The data pertaining to the advisability of the establishment of a State Board for the Junior Colleges, and
2. The composition, duties, powers and responsibilities of such a board, and
3. The statutory and fiscal implications involved in such a change of governance, and
4. The means for insuring that such a change will not endanger the present system of joint local-state governance, and be it further

Resolved, That results of this study be reported to the Council no later than October 1966, so that the Council may appropriately advise the 1967 session of the Legislature.

---

[1] A Council-sponsored, inter-segmental committee with the permanent charge to consider matters affecting continuing education programs of the several segments. See, CCHE, *Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education* #1005 (Sacramento and San Francisco, July 1963), 45 pp.

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

SECTION I

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

By Dr. Dale Tillery

THE ISSUES

As Junior College education enters its second half century in California, it gains new status, new resources, and new problems. The seventy-five colleges which compose this loosely affiliated system of post-secondary education are in a period of great transition. They face the problems which beset all higher education in an age of social and technical revolutions—only more so. Approximately 40% of *all* full-time students in California public higher education and 70% of full-time freshmen and sophomores are in Junior College classrooms which they share with over 300,000 part-time students. With rapid growth many of the nearly 7,000 teachers are new to Junior Colleges with no firm commitment to the goals of an institution with which they have had only limited experience. And the problems of increase in staff are intensified by the new authority which Junior College teachers have demanded and achieved. The establishing and functioning of academic senates suggest new stresses as well as strengths for college management and for those who make policy.

The internal changes in structure and authority have counterparts in the statewide governmental agencies and professional associations which seek to give direction to Junior College education. The colleges are still enmeshed in the rules and regulations of the secondary schools at a time when they have been brought into the family of higher education by a master plan seeking to coordinate and develop the several segments of higher education. In addition, the Junior Colleges are served by a State Board and a Department of Education which, in the most populous and educationally ambitious state of the nation, must concern themselves with kindergarten through Junior College education.

Officials who seek to husband State resources and plan the development of a diversified system of higher education for California are frequently baffled by the dispersion of Junior College authority. With 66 governing boards and a half-dozen associations involved in determining and influencing educational policy, the question—"Who speaks for the Junior Colleges?"—is frequently asked. When statewide trustees or commissioners are proposed as a means of bringing order out of diversity, many Junior College leaders argue that centralization is anathema to the community college concept and that the very diversity criticized by State planners is the source of Junior College strength and uniqueness.

But the special qualities of the comprehensive community college are being both threatened and promoted by numerous influences. For example, the national programs of support for technical-vocational education and for attacking the problems of the educationally disadvantaged may counterbalance recent trends toward traditional academic orientations in curriculum and teaching. The resulting debate, conflict, and experimentation could give new vigor to Junior College education and help reaffirm its identity.

California is covered with handsome new two-year college campuses, many of them models of college planning for the rest of the nation; and at least 30 additional new colleges are to be built by 1970. The costs of this capital development have been carried by local communities until recently. However, in 1963 the Legislature declared that the costs of Junior College education were to be shared by the State and local communities. They proceeded, then, to appropriate $20,000,000 for capital outlay purposes. Recently, the voters of California approved a measure which would provide an additional $50,000,000 for Junior College construction. For current costs the State will apportion more than $48,000,000 in fiscal 1964–65 to Junior Colleges, but nearly three times this amount will come from local taxes. Although it has not yet been achieved, there appear to be no insurmountable barriers to achieving a near 50-50 sharing of Junior College costs between the two levels of government.

By their history and by their legal mandate California Junior Colleges are to complement not mimic the other segments of higher education. Such diversity among equals recognizes certain overlapping in the qualifications of students served and the nature of programs offered by the Junior Colleges, California State Colleges, and the University of California. But the Junior Colleges are particularly charged with providing services and programs not offered by the other levels of higher education and to educate a more heterogeneous student body. The will, the resources, and the teaching talents are at present only partially available to meet the charge. The lack in any of these factors can be translated into students without educational opportunity. In this sense the issues which emerge from this report on California Junior Colleges beg a fundamental question: Who shall be educated?

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PAST

A sketch of California Junior College history should emphasize only those events and influences which have given rise to present issues in Junior College education. Most of these issues were anticipated by men who spoke for this new institution at the turn of the century and during its subsequent development. To be more precise such leaders as Lange, Jordan, McLane, and Snyder among others helped shape these issues since they were participants in America's innovation in higher education. It is fitting, then, to sketch the historic factors which seem to underline the contemporary issues.

WHO SHALL BE TAUGHT?

There has long been debate about the intention of the first Junior College enabling law in California, the *Caminetti Bill* of 1907. This legislation grew out of the increasing practice of permitting students to return to high school after graduation. Students returned to make up deficiences for college entrance, to achieve advance standing in college, and to gain greater vocational proficiency. To be sure the bill provided that courses of study "shall approximate the studies prescribed in the first two years of university courses." Lest we forget, however, the University of California's own practical and service programs as a land grant college made it quite acceptable for the first California Junior College to offer both academic and vocational courses. In advocating the establishment of Fresno Junior College in 1910, Superintendent Charles McLane urged that the college offer courses in "agriculture, manual training, domestic science, and other technical work in addition to regular academic courses." It was the University's own spokesman, Alexis F. Lange, who commended Fresno for providing opportunities for higher vocational training. And in particular, Dean Lange joined with McLane and the other high school leaders who developed early Junior Colleges in advocating post-high school education for those who could not afford, or who were not ready or interested in attending the universities.

These were the beginnings, then, of the people's college. Although the impetus and philosophy were there for broad curricula, the resources were not. The Laws of 1917 and 1921 and subsequent acts of the California Legislature encouraged the courses which were to be increasingly relevant to all segments of California society. In addition to expanding vocational-technical programs, new emphasis was given to guidance and to remedial, general, and adult education. It was this complex of Junior College programs and services which was reaffirmed by the major surveys of California higher education following World War II, culminating in the Master Plan for Higher Education which brought the Junior Colleges firmly into the folds of higher education. Thus, today, while the other segments of the State system are to be differentially selective, the Junior Colleges are to serve all who can profit from this wide range of instruction. This by definition, therefore, includes all high school graduates. The consequence in 1965 is that California approaches the recent recommendation of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association for universal opportunity for education beyond the high school. As it does so, however, there is new sharpness to the questions: Are courses which are relevant to the less able and less motivated Junior College students actually of college level? Can we get teachers who are able and willing to teach students with such a wide range of abilities and interests? Can California afford the costs of providing some college education for most of its citizens?

WHAT IS THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ROLE?

The doubts about the identity of Junior Colleges have not been put to rest in spite of Master Plan declarations and Junior College assertions. History sheds considerable light on this lingering ambivalence about Junior College education, but it is not enough to show that in the beginning the two-year colleges were deeply rooted in the secondary school system from which they gained their leadership, resources, and legal identity. Of equal importance is the theoretical basis for this union which was clearer in an age when secondary education was less drastically separated from higher education. For those who conceived and supported the Junior College there was a natural union between the last two years of high school and the first two years of college. David Starr Jordan of Stanford gave full sweep to the concept of the bifurcated university, advocated by Michigan's Tappan and Chicago's Harper, by urging that American universities abandon their Junior College functions. About the same time, 1908, Lange argued that the freshmen and sophomore years in universities were "mere continuation of secondary education under poorer teachers, very likely." He went on to say that since it was impossible to bring the University within "walking distance of every doorstep," the University should "reduce its swollen fortune in freshmen and sophomores" by actively promoting their distribution among other institutions. In particular, educational opportunities could be extended by adding two years to the existing four-year high schools.

The call for differentiation and even separation of the thirteenth and fourteenth years from the high schools is a counter force in the development of California Junior Colleges. As early as 1915 a University of California publication, *The Junior Colleges in California,* stated,

> "It is clearly desirable that . . . the junior college courses should be organized and conducted

> on a collegiate as distinguished from a high school basis. In general, it is clearly desirable that such courses should be regarded as more advanced, should employ methods implying greater maturity, should be in a word, beyond the powers of high school students."

With the ever-increasing number of transfer students in Junior Colleges the University's demands for "parallelism" in course standards grew stronger and were instrumental in shaping the collegiate orientation of contemporary Junior Colleges.

It seems likely that the expanding programs and services which characterized the two-year "capstones" to California high schools in the thirties and post-war period were the most important factors in separating Junior Colleges from secondary education. The Legislature became increasingly insistent that funds earmarked for Junior College education be used only for that purpose by school districts, and it finally encouraged and then mandated the development of independent Junior College districts. The Junior Colleges, however, remained part of the public school system and were legally identified as secondary education. It is only with the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 that the Junior Colleges of California were designated as one of three segments of public higher education. Nevertheless, the statutory and administrative regulations which associated the two-year colleges with secondary education remain operative; and the institution's identity was further confused when the Legislature in 1963, in a mood of expediency, once again defined the Junior Colleges as part of secondary education in order to insure continued flow of funds from the National Defense Education Act.

It is unlikely that the existing confusion in identity can be erased by legislative mandate. The heart of the matter is the changing nature of higher education in American society. Within this context, the Junior Colleges are playing an important role in the continuous process of defining higher education. The relevant issue in 1965 is whether they can preserve, let alone enhance, their uniqueness in partnership with four-year colleges and universities.

HOW SHALL CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES BE GOVERNED?

The Junior Colleges of California have grown from the energies, aspirations, and resources of local communities. Early legislation provided little guidance, but also few restrictions, to individual high school boards of trustees in establishing and managing the first Junior Colleges. The State clearly reserved to itself, however, the right to determine the conditions under which Junior Colleges might be formed, the programs which they might offer, and the means by which they could be financed. But, to this day the determination of local citizens and their initiative are essential to the establishment of Junior College services.

Nevertheless, the distribution of authority in the governance of Junior Colleges was always complex and has become increasingly so as the colleges have grown in number, complexity, and influence. Since 1907 legislative acts and State Board of Education regulations have established an increasingly detailed framework within which local trustees determine policy. Today there exists a baffling array of mandates and provisions sprinkled throughout the *Education Code* and Title 5 of the *Administrative Code* for governing Junior Colleges. Moreover, no less than fifteen State departments and agencies serve or make demands on the Junior Colleges.

While this pluralism of authority has complicated the lives of administrators and those who engage in long-term planning for the coordination of California higher education, it has insured the primacy of local authority in Junior College governance.

In the first half of the century remarkable sharing of experiences and problems through formal and informal associations contributed both to the vitality of the Junior Colleges and to securing supportive legislation. But pluralism meant many voices, and localism became a barrier to the establishment of statewide plans for Junior College development. Consequently, with the pressing problems of finance, enrollments, and coordination during the postwar years, piecemeal legislation was produced affecting Junior Colleges in response to both new and conflicting voices throughout the State. Not the least of these new voices were those of faculty groups seeking a new role in recommending educational policy.

To be sure this pattern of decision without study and legislation without plan, was characteristic of the way many states responded to staggering demands for higher education in the fifties. California, however, began a series of studies of higher education which culminated in the Master Plan of 1960. The resulting efforts to coordinate the growth, finance, and functions of the various segments of higher education focused sharp attention of the diffuse State responsibilities vis-á-vis the Junior Colleges and the diversity in the governance of these institutions, in contrast to the relatively centralized control of the State College and University systems. Today key questions are being asked: Should the splintered services and authority of State agencies be centralized into an agency authorized to recommend comprehensive policy for California's Junior Colleges? Would a separate State governing board for Junior Colleges enhance or stifle the ability of local colleges to serve the majority of youth seeking admission to college?

Are pluralism in authority and diversity in practice strengths in the governance of collegiate institutions which are undervalued by those who struggled with the monumental tasks of coordination and finance? How can the community college be strengthened within a statewide program of rational planning and use of resources?

WHO WILL PAY THE BILL?

It was clearly the intent of early legislation to make Junior Colleges part of the free public school system of the State and to prescribe the formulae by which local communities might raise funds to do the job. Furthermore, constitutional protection of the State School Fund provided a continuity of State support. The growing number of colleges benefited by the State's concern for minimum standards for all public education and the consequent rise in foundation programs and measures to equalize the differing abilities of local communities to pay the bill. Nevertheless, it has been the local taxpayer who has carried the major share of the cost of educating Junior College students. On a statewide basis school districts have been paying recently approximately 70–75% of Junior College costs.

As early as 1932 a study of higher education, the "Suzzallo Report", recommended that the State should pay half the costs of educating Junior College students. Yet, this was before the great building programs of the past two decades. Actually, until the Junior College Tax Relief Act of 1961 the State paid nothing for Junior College construction. Today, however, with its new responsibilities in higher education the Junior Colleges are seeking and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education has recommended continuing State responsibility for 40–45% of average construction costs. Bonding propositions in 1962 and 1964 indicate readiness on the part of the Legislature to fulfill its financial commitments to the Junior College under the Donahoe Act of 1960. When combined with the Higher Education Facilities Act of the Federal Government, these State efforts promise significant relief to local communities in paying the costs of Junior College education.

The issue of who will pay for Junior College education has always been intertwined with questions about who will be educated by these colleges and who will govern them. As the balance of support begins to shift, these questions take on a new importance. Should students pay part of the cost of Junior College education through fees for student services or even tuition? If so, would such fees eliminate students who are in greatest need of this level of education? If the State assumes an increasing share of the costs should it not have more to say about the objectives of Junior Colleges and how they are managed?

"THE BIG SHIFT TO JUNIOR COLLEGES"

The post-war years in general and the present decade in particular represent periods of remarkable growth for Junior Colleges in California. Table 1 shows the relative growth of Junior College enrollments when compared with the other segments of California higher education and includes projected enrollments through 1975.

TABLE 1

Full-Time Enrollments in California Higher Education *

Year	Junior Colleges	State Colleges	UC	Private	Total
1945	17,406	6,851	18,400	19,661	62,318
1950	56,622	25,369	39,492	41,036	162,521
1955	70,165	33,910	37,035	40,003	181,113
1960	99,783	56,480	46,801	53,785	257,725
1961	112,636	64,099	51,340	57,220	286,223
1962	121,283	71,502	55,775	61,234	310,888
1963	128,221	80,188	61,073	61,618	332,339
1964	152,401	92,454	67,070	64,000	375,425
PROJECTIONS					
1965	172,150	95,000	78,025	68,500	413,675
1970	216,200	134,475	105,150	81,800	537,625
1975	267,100	166,325	125,300	91,100	649,825

* The data prior to 1960 are from A Study of the Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California; those from 1960–1964 are from reports of total and full-time enrollments as prepared by the Department of Finance. Projections are from CCHE, California's Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education, #1014 (Sacramento, December 1964), p. 17.

The Junior Colleges enrolled approximately 411,000 students of which at least 152,000 were full-time in the fall of 1964, illustrating the magnitude of "The Big Shift to Junior Colleges," the caption used by the San Francisco *Chronicle* in reporting preliminary 1964 registration figures for the three segments of public higher education in California. Such a shift was encouraged by the Master Plan with its proposals for the diversion of lower-division students to the Junior College system. As a result of such diversion it was expected that Junior College enrollments would grow by about 225% from 1958 to 1975. However, as will be pointed out, neither the University of California nor the State Colleges have, to date, successfully promoted the diversion of students to Junior Colleges.

In examining the problem of numbers in Junior College education it is misleading to report only full-time enrollments. Whereas only about 5% of University students and 40% of State College students are registered for less than 12 units, nearly 70% of Junior College students are so defined as part-time students. Assuming a status quo ratio of part-time to full-time

TABLE 2

Projected Full and Part-Time Enrollments in California Junior Colleges *

Year	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
1963	128,221	305,586	433,809
1965	172,150	409,439	581,589
1970	216,200	514,205	730,405
1975	267,100	635,265	902,365

* These figures based on a 70.4/29.6 part-time to full-time ratio derived from 1963 data.

students as indicated by fall 1963 enrollments, it is likely that nearly 1,000,000 students will be attending Junior Colleges by 1975. Table 2 shows this projection of total enrollments based upon projections for full-time students.

DISTRIBUTION OF COLLEGES

The recent growth in Junior College enrollments represents concerted efforts by State and local officials to provide more equitable post-high school education for citizens from all parts of the state. This has not always been the case since Junior College development has, until recently, lacked any kind of State plan. Local communities have had different commitments, as well as resources in providing Junior College education for their citizens. As recently as 1957 it was possible for the following statement to be made in *A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California:*

> Junior colleges are local institutions which are distributed somewhat unevenly throughout the state, and there are a number of areas of the state where additional junior college facilities are needed and where the local assessed valuation is sufficient to support them. Had the institutions needed been well established, it is estimated that 1955 enrollments would have included an additional 11,500 full-time students.[1]

This inequity can be illustrated more sharply by noting that in the fall 1955, whereas San Francisco County had 55.4% of its high school graduates of the two preceding years enrolled as Junior College students, Alameda County—without adequate Junior College coverage—enrolled only 17.4% of the graduates. This dramatic difference is consistent with more recent investigations which show that higher percentage of high school graduates attend college when there is a local Junior College available than when other types of institutions or no institutions serve an area. Furthermore, even in metropolitan communities college attendance varies inversely as the distance from Junior College campuses.

The Master Plan identified 21 areas of the state which needed Junior College service. By mid-1964 action had been taken in all of these areas to provide local Junior College service either by annexation to existing Junior College districts or by the formation of new ones. Four districts not anticipated by the Master Plan have also been formed. As a result of this development approximately 80% of all high school graduates are in districts served by local Junior Colleges. On the other hand 35,614 high school graduates still were not in such districts as of April 1964. Studies concerned with the establishment of new districts or annexation to existing districts are under way, and it is likely that by 1966 only the most remote and sparsely populated areas of California will remain outside Junior College districts.

FLOW OF STUDENTS

Before discussing the implications of growth in size and number of Junior Colleges, it should be noted that a reasonable enrollment balance among the three segments of public higher education is developing. The long history of articulation among these institutions and the major studies upon which California's Master Plan rests all call for ready access to Junior Colleges by citizens in all communities of the state. The proper functioning of the State Colleges and the Univeristy of California are closely related to the flow of students from the two-year colleges. This flow includes students who, although eligible for admission to a four-year institution, find it wise or necessary to attend Junior Colleges first, and an even larger number of students who earn their eligibility to enter the four-year colleges as a result of successful Junior College work. In 1959, 56.4% of California's high school graduates were ineligible to enter the other two segments of public higher education. Under provisions of the Master Plan this percentage should increase to some 63% by fall 1965.

The ratios of high school graduates eligible for admission to the State Colleges and to the University are misleading. It is important to note that the University draws only about one-third of the 12½% of high school graduates who are considered eligible for admission. In turn the State Colleges enroll only one-fifth of the approximately 40% of the graduates who are presently eligible for admission. (In fall 1965 the percentage eligible will drop to 33⅓%.) A 1962 study by the Department of Education confirms the impression that many of these "eligible" students do select Junior Colleges for first admission. Approximately 5% of the 1962 Junior College freshmen were eligible to enter the University and approximately 33% to enter State Colleges. Another way of looking at this matter of choice is to note the percentage of eligible students who chose Junior Colleges. Nearly 20% of University-eligible students in 1961 attended Junior Colleges. Although comparable data are not available for the graduates eligible to enter State Colleges, it is likely that a considerably higher percentage of these students attend Junior Colleges.

SUMMARY

There is considerable misinformation abroad about the percentage of California high school graduates who attend college. The most recent report from the United State Office of Education indicates that over three-fourths of all California's graduates enter some college. It is likely that this finding does not take into consideration the large migration of college-age youth into California nor the large number of older students who enter college for the first time. In any case this estimate of college-going is much higher than that reported by the State Department of Finance. In 1961 it was estimated that 52% of high school graduates of that year entered some college in and out of California. The distribution of these students among the several institutions is shown in Table 3. This would seem to be a valid picture of college going among California high school graduates. It also indicates the upward trend in the percentage of graduates entering college as predicted by the Master Plan studies.

---

[1] Sacramento: State Board of Education, 1957, p. 25.

TABLE 3

Percentage of 1961 Graduates of California Public High Schools Who Entered Institutions of Higher Education

Institution	*Percentage*
University of California	5%
California State Colleges	8%
California Junior Colleges	32%
California Private Colleges or Universities	5%
Out-of-State Colleges or Universities	2%
Total	52%

As was suggested earlier, new concerns for keeping youngsters in school and providing more and better education for employment should increase the percentage of students who finish high school and seek post-high school education. It is likely that a large number of these students will choose Junior Colleges. It may be, then, that the 50,000 students who are to be diverted from the State Colleges and the University of California under provisions of the Master Plan will represent a relatively small share of the increasing burden on California Junior Colleges. The unknown dimension of such new responsibilities is only one indication of the urgent need for intensive and longitudinal studies of college going in California.

JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

It is meaningless to talk about "the Junior College student" as if he had characteristics which set him apart from other college students. In fact the one thing that most typifies Junior College student bodies is their heterogeneity. There are always wide ranges of abilities, interests, backgrounds, and motivations. In California this diversity results primarily from the comprehensive services and curricula of the Junior Colleges. As non-selective colleges they not only provide education for students who do not seek or are not able to transfer to a four-year institution, but they attract a high percentage of those students who are fully qualified to enter the University and the State Colleges. Although certain data will be reported on the "typical" Junior College student as determined by statistical averages, the findings may be misleading. It seems important, therefore, to be aware of the differences among the colleges and of various sub-groups within a single campus. For example, some of the characteristics discussed below will be influenced by the fact that only about 30% of the full-time and part-time enrollments at Junior Colleges in recent years have been women. This large ratio of men to women has implications for data on measured aptitude, educational aspiration, and most other characteristics.

ABILITY AND PRIOR PERFORMANCE

An examination of several recent institutional studies would suggest that a 1953 California study of 13 Junior Colleges and the diversity studies at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley were still valid in describing the academic aptitude of Junior College students. The full range of aptitudes, as measured by standard tests, is found in Junior College student bodies; and these colleges tend to attract almost equally from the quartiles of ability levels. In general the mean test scores for Junior College freshmen is somewhat lower than that for the four-year institutions. However, as would be expected, the overlap within the two types of institutions is great. Furthermore, within each segment of California higher education there are differences in mean aptitude scores for individual colleges. This is true for campuses of the University, the State Colleges, as well as Junior Colleges.

Although no adequate study has been made of the distribution of academic aptitude among the California institutions, it is quire apparent that the mean aptitude levels of the three segments of public higher education reflect the differential admission standards of the institutions. On the other hand there is evidence from the Berkeley studies that some Junior Colleges have mean scores which equal or exceed the mean scores of some State Colleges. This may be due, in part, to the differences in programs found at the various Junior Colleges. It is not surprising that students of varying academic aptitude distribute themselves differently among the several programs offered by the Junior Colleges. In general, the students who declare transfer objectives have considerably higher mean scores than those in terminal programs. Among the numerous non-transfer programs, however, there are marked differences in student aptitude. The more selective technical fields, for example, attract students whose academic aptitude is superior to that of most students in a number of transfer majors. Although there are no complete California data, it would appear that Medsker's analysis of ability levels in various curricular fields is valid. He pointed out that "those curricula which attract high-ability transfer students also attract high-ability terminal students and vice versa."

Low Ability Students. A major concern in Junior College education is finding ways of providing meaningful education for low-ability students. Berg has suggested in a recent study that about 10% of Junior College day students might be identified as low ability students, however, his sample fell within the 16–30 percentile range on the School and College Aptitude Test. The Berkeley studies showed that 16% of entering two-year college students fell one standard deviation or more below the mean of total entrants, and it has been suggested that these students might be assumed to have IQ's of 100 or below. More definitive studies are needed to determine the incidence of low academic aptitude among Junior College students and the relationship of such ability to achievement and persistence. But it appears that the California two-year colleges must offer appropriate courses and instruction for a sizable group of young men and women with ability below that traditionally associated with college-level programs. Such a conclusion is reinforced when it is recalled that the Junior Colleges are to educate students whose high school performance did not qualify them to enter other public institutions. Many of these students bring not only deficiencies in specific subject matter, but deficiencies in basic academic skills. Although it has been shown that approximately two-thirds of entering Junior College students fall below the performance level required for admission to the State Colleges, there are differences in the ratio of eligible students attracted to individual Junior Colleges. One well-established college recently reported that a majority of its freshmen were eligible to enter four-year institutions.

High Ability Students. The two-year colleges have always been and, perhaps, will increasingly be able to attract students of superior ability. Note has been made previously of the large number of students who could have been admitted to four-year colleges. The consequence is that approximately one-third of entering Junior College students are above the mean of their fellow students who enter senior colleges. This finding is similar to that reported by Seashore in his 1958 study of academic abilities of Junior College freshmen as reported in the October 1958 *Junior College Journal*. Among these able students in the California colleges are those who were able to attend the University of California but chose their local community college. On measures of aptitude they are, as a group, above national means, but less impressive than their peers who actually entered the University. It is also important to note that the interests and motivations of these select groups of Junior College students are somewhat different from those of their peers. This finding seemed to suggest that even very able students at the community colleges may need an environment which is concerned with their development as students, and teachers who are committed to that task.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

There are now sufficient data about the antecedent characteristics of Junior College students to permit several generalizations. These are made with the full recognition that community colleges attract students from all sections of California society. Nevertheless, students from the homes of clerical, skilled, and unskilled workers are greatly in the majority. Clark, for example, found that the student body at San Jose Junior College reflected the socioeconomic structure of the community it served. This and other studies indicate, too, that the more metropolitan the community, the more Junior College students will come from working class families. The relationship of family background to factors relevant to success in college are well established. Several of these factors are of considerable importance to Junior College education.

1. A majority of California Junior College students have parents with only high school educations.
2. Family encouragement and support is low for many Junior College students since education is not highly valued by the family. On the other hand, the upward social mobility of some working class families may result in unrealistic aspirations on the part of many students.
3. The majority of Junior College students find it necessary to work in order to support themselves in college. Often this means reduced course loads or such stress that achievement is impaired.
4. The relative lack of cultural and civic interests in homes from which a majority of Junior College students come may have profound effects on student motivation and achievement . . . and on the general student environment of the colleges.

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

A common experience for Junior College teachers and counselors is to discover the lack of realism in the vocational and educational goals of students. Many of these young men and women make a late decision to enter college, and others come to Junior College because they could not be admitted to other institutions. Consequently, a major objective of the community college is to help students revise their goals in the light of their aptitudes, interests, and past preparation. In particular, this means that many students discover that they cannot transfer to a four-year college. Whereas, over two-thirds of entering Junior College freshmen declare transfer majors only about one-third actually transfer. Many of those who fail in transfer programs are referred to as "latent terminals", and their counselors and teachers have the difficult task of helping them shift to appropriate programs for employment rather than drop out of college. It would appear that the failure of parents, students, and high school counselors to examine the wide range of educational opportunities offered by their community colleges is a major factor in this problem. In contrast the Junior Colleges have had notable success in stimulating potentially high ability students who have set their goals too low.

Dr. Medsker has recently stated that "a large percent of Junior college students have not developed well-defined attitudes about the purposes of education and are in college either because of today's cultural pressures or because they cannot find employment." This is, perhaps, related to the findings that community college students tend to be more vocationally oriented than their four-year college peers. This is as it should be, but such student values pose problems for teachers who are primarily committed to intellectual and cultural values. Furthermore, in spite of this vocational orientation, few students have a very adequate picture of the kind of work and the educational requirements for various occupations.

In general, Junior College students show greater tendency toward authoritarianism and less tendency toward intellectual interests and reflective thought than do students at the four-year colleges. This is even true of those young men and women who are eligible to enter the University of California but who chose a local college. These student attitudes may result in a less than stimulating peer environment for intellectually oriented students. These findings place special responsibilities on Junior College faculties to provide intellectual and cultural stimulation in and outside the classroom. In this regard there is ample evidence that the relatively authoritarian student can be reached with appropriate teaching and an environment which is concerned with his growth.

PERSISTENCE AND ACHIEVEMENT IN COLLEGE

Recent studies of student attrition suggest that the high mortality data generally reported for higher education need to be refined. National studies have indicated that approximately 50% of those freshmen who begin college complete eight semesters of work. For all institutions attrition in the first two years of college is great. Iffert in 1958 reported that 72.7% of four-year college students completed at least one year of college, and this is only slightly more than the percentage he reported for Junior Colleges. One of the most complete studies of a single California Junior College shows a similar drop-out for freshmen who enrolled in 1961. In this investigation 68.5% of the class completed at least two semesters of work. Only 42%, however, completed four semesters at the college. As might have been expected, there was much variation in the persistence of students with various patterns of high school preparation. Table 4 shows the relationship between persistence and high school preparation, as well as the holding power of students in the four levels of English placement. It is this type of investigation which provides important insights into the disturbing drop-out problem in Junior Colleges.

TABLE 4

Persistence of 952 Students Enrolled in 1961 in a California Junior College

Eligible for	*1st Sem*	*2nd Sem*	*3rd Sem*	*4th Sem*	*Percentage Survival*
University	38	23	27	28	73.6%
State College	265	198	183	159	60
(7 units A or B)					
State College	84	61	41	37	44
(5-6½ units A or B)					
Ineligible	200	141	90	72	36
(college prep)					
Ineligible	365	222	125	109	29.9
(vocational program)					
Total Enrolled	952	650	461	405	42
English Placement					
1B	1	1	1	1	100
1A	219	163	133	123	56
51	303	215	167	146	48
71	429	271	159	134	31

Not enough is yet known about the persistence of Junior College students on a statewide basis. It is clear, however, that there are differences in the holding power among the several institutions. As a matter of fact some Junior Colleges boast about their success in holding on to students, and others about the numbers they dismiss. In general, however, the Bureau of Junior College Education in a report to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education suggested that approximately 50% of Junior College freshmen continue in the second year, and that about 30% complete two years of study. It also pointed out that about 50% of those who leave within the two years have completed a "less-than-two-year" course of study.

The percentage of students who graduate from Junior Colleges is not a suitable measure of student persistence nor of institutional success. Many students who transfer to four-year colleges do not apply for graduation, and a large percentage of those in general and occupational education do not stay long enough . . . nor do they have graduation as a goal. This is quite apparent when a comparison is made of graduates in any year as compared with the full-time sophomores in the previous year. For example, there were 18,536 Junior College graduates in June 1963 for a *fall 1962* enrollment of 78,864 sophomores—34,400 of whom were full-time. This can be only a rough comparison because Junior College students frequently do not fit the usual class designations, nor do they complete their studies in the usual sequence of semesters.

It seems quite clear that the number of Junior College students who transfer to either the University of California or the State Colleges has not kept pace with the growth of Junior College enrollments. For example, the number of transfers to the University in 1962 was almost exactly what it was in 1950 although full-time Junior College enrollments nearly doubled. During this period, however, the Junior Colleges sent an increasing number of advanced students to the State Colleges. But again, Junior College growth would suggest a larger total number of transfers. In the past five years of growth, the two-year colleges have increased the annual number of transfer students to the State Colleges by slightly over 1,200. As a matter of fact it appears that there has been an absolute drop in this level of transfer from 1960 to 1962. These and other data are shown in Table 5 and Table 6.

TABLE 5

Junior College Transfers to the University of California 1950–1962 *

Year	*Eligible*	*Ineligible*	*Total*
1950	--	--	2588
1955	939	1873	2812
1956	976	2106	3082
1957	1090	1351	2441
1958	1234	1257	2491
1959	--	--	--
1960	1158	1238	2396
1961	1180	1398	2569
1962	1358	1159	2517

* Data from the annual reports on Junior College transfers from the Office of Educational Relations, University of California, Berkeley.

TABLE 6

Junior College Transfers to the California State Colleges 1957–1962 *

Year	*Total Transfers*
1957	6109
1958	7141
1959	7550
1960	8581
1961	--
1962	8317

* Data from The Center for the Study of Higher Education, Berkeley.

It should be noted that certain recent changes in the number of transfers to both the State Colleges and the University will have been influenced by provisions requiring Junior College students to complete full or nearly full lower division programs before transferring. For example, since 1960 the State Colleges have required ineligible students to complete a minimum of 60 units at a Junior College, and effective in the fall 1962 the University required transfers to complete 56 acceptable units with a grade point average (G.P.A.) of 2.4.

There is now a respectable body of data about the success of California Junior College students at both the University of California and the California State Colleges. The recent transfer study conducted by Knoell and Medsker and annual reports from the University's Office Relations with Schools suggest some slight changes in achievement of transfers from Junior Colleges when compared with data from major studies earlier in the decade. These early studies by Bird, Medsker and others are summarized as a prelude to more recent findings.

(1) **State Colleges.** The grade point average of Junior College transfers has been slightly below that of native students, although the differential decreases with each succeeding semester. As is true at the University, eligible students earned higher g.p.a.'s after transfer than did the ineligible students. In general the ineligibles did less well on aptitude and achievement tests administered at the time of transfer, and their probation rate was higher, as was the drop-out rate. Medsker reported persistence rates of 78% at Fresno State College and 87% at San Jose State College at the end of the third semester after transfer. This compared to a persistence rate of 91% for native students.

(2) **The University of California.** The record of students who were eligible to enter the University for first admission did nearly as well as the native students although fewer persisted over three semesters. In general the withdrawal rate was about 35% for all transfers and 17% for native students. Since the less able students dropped out, there was a general increase in g.p.a. for those who remained . . . for both eligible and ineligible groups. The latter students tended to earn grade point averages ranging from .15 to .30 below those of the eligible and native students.

Recent analysis of the records of transfer students to the University of California by the Office of Relations with Schools indicates some change in the persistence rates at Berkeley and UCLA. In 1953, 80% of the eligibles at Berkeley persisted over three semesters at Berkeley as compared to 72% of the students who entered after transfer in 1961. At UCLA the eligibles improved with a persistence of 72% in 1961 as compared to an earlier persistence of 68%. Interestingly enough, the UCLA ineligibles also had a three semester persistence of 72% as compared with the 1953 rate of 69%. Both transfer groups at the two campuses continue to earn over a C average for the first semester after transfer.

The following data are adapted from the Knoell-Medsker report for a sample of Junior College students who transferred in 1960 to selected four-year campuses in California.

TABLE 7

First Semester Transfer Records of Selected Institutions by Junior College Students in 1960

Achievement	*UCB*	*UCLA*	*U. of Pac.*	*USC*	*Long Beach State*	*SF State*
Continued with "C" or better	64%	70%	62%	83%	73%	66%
Continued with below "C"	24%	20%	22%	15%	22%	20%
Failed to comp. term or withdrew end of term	12%	10%	15%	2%	5%	14%

The grade point differentials for five of the above institutions for first semester work and for cumulative grades for two years after transfer are shown in Table 8. These data are from Table 37 in *Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two- to Four-Year Colleges* published by the Center for the Study of Higher Education.

TABLE 8

Grade Point Differentials of Junior College Transfers at Selected Four-Year Institutions

Institution	*Differentials with Junior College g.p.a.*	
	First Term	*Cumulative*
UCB	—.65	—.57
UCLA	—.55	—.47
Long Beach State	—.24	—.16
S.F. State	—.29	—.26
U. of Pacific	—.25	—.12

Among the major questions which develop from this brief look at the number and success of students who transfer from California Junior Colleges to four-year institutions are the following: (1) In view of the great emphasis placed on transfer education in California Junior Colleges is the actual frequency of transfer disproportionately low? (2) Would the achievement and persistence of transfer students improve if Junior Colleges were free to prescribe programs of lower division preparation and certify the readiness of students to transfer? (3) Should there not be intensive studies of the characteristics of transfer students as related to achievement in institutions with differing characteristics in order to better counsel students in the selection of a transfer college or university?

WHAT IS TO BE TAUGHT?

Within a brief span of fifty years Junior College offerings have grown from a few post-high school courses to comprehensive curricula which include full lower-division preparation for transfer, a wide spectrum of technical-vocational programs, and courses for general and continuing education. Each of these areas of the Junior College curriculum represents such diversity of opportunity for youth and adults that they should be described in detail.

PREPARATION FOR TRANSFER

Thanks to the early support from the University of California and to years of articulation with both the University and the State Colleges, the transferability of Junior College credit is today well established. A recent study of transfer students shows California to be ahead of other states in this successful flow of students to four-year institutions. Furthermore, the very structure of higher education in this state is based on the flow of students who have begun or completed their lower-division work in Junior Colleges. It is interesting to note how the recent Master Plan is implementing Dean Lange's early advice about distributing the University's (and now the State Colleges') "swollen resources in freshmen and sophomores" to the Junior Colleges. Today approximately 75% of California's lower-division students are studying in the two-year institutions, and by 1975 this figure should reach 85%. It is quite obvious that such a dominant role for Junior Colleges in preparing students for transfer could be possible only if these colleges had programs of comparable quality when compared to those of the four-year institutions.

To be sure, the Junior Colleges have faced serious problems in gaining full acceptability for their courses. Furthermore, they have had to balance their experimentation against the demands for course parallelism from the University and more recently from the State Colleges. Another difficulty in this history of articulation has been the lack of uniformity within and among the colleges and universities. Diversity in standards, content, and methods makes the struggle for parallelism almost ridiculous. Are there no alternatives? A solution which is recommended by many Junior College leaders is for colleges and universities to accept at face value those courses which Junior Colleges certify as meeting requirements for junior standing. The State Colleges and Junior Colleges have approximated such an arrangement, and the success of transfer students from the latter institutions would justify a comparable experiment in the transfer of Junior College students to campuses of the University of California. It appears that the Junior Colleges, themselves, have not taken seriously this proposal for certifying students for transfer even though the quality of instruction and the advisement of students in these colleges should contribute to the success of such an arrangement. Whether this or some other proposal is adopted, it seems imperative that Junior Colleges play leadership roles in the development of lower division education.

There are few if any undergraduate majors for which a student cannot receive appropriate lower-division preparation at his local community college. Furthermore, if he should take the proper sequence of courses, he would be granted full junior status upon transferring to a State College or a campus of the University. In actual practice, however, many students transfer with minor deficiencies which must be completed before they are fully recognized as upper-division students by their transfer institution. Occasionally a specific Junior College may not offer a full major in a highly specialized field such as architecture, and eligible students are advised to transfer after one year at a Junior College.

Since a normal lower division program includes approximately 60 units of study, it is common for 20–40 units to be required for the major. The remaining units are devoted to the liberal arts and elective options. Frequently, of course, students must repair deficiencies before beginning or completing work in the major. As a result, their Junior College work may well exceed 60 units. Although individual Junior Colleges prescribe requirements for the associate-in-arts degree, transfer students need not meet these requirements as a condition for transfer. Occasionally they cannot do so if they are to complete specialized requirements for their majors.

Although at present nearly one-third (in 1963, 28.17) of total Junior College enrollments are in "occupation-centered" curricula, many of the courses which make up these programs are part of the regular lower-division curriculum. Since the remaining two-thirds of the enrollments are in transfer curricula, it can be seen that the offerings of the Junior Colleges are heavily oriented toward traditional lower division work. It is necessary to ask if this preponderance of transfer courses—remembering the pressures for "parallelism"—is congruent with either the general education or vocational needs of the majority of students whom the Junior Colleges are to serve?

PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

The scope of Junior College programs designed to prepare students for employment covers virtually the entire range of skilled and technical occupations. Individual Junior Colleges differ in the nature of their "occupation centered" curricula because of differences in the communities they serve, institutional size and resources, and commitments to occupational education. There are over 120 separate occupational curricula offered by California Junior Colleges with some colleges offering as few as three and others with more than fifty programs. The most common technical programs are engineering technology, electronics technology, and drafting. Business occupations make up the largest vocational group attracting 13.8% of all students in 1963 who declared majors.

Some of the vocational curricula listed in catalogues involve a mere clustering of standard courses which tradition or investigation suggest as appropriate preparation for employment in an occupational field. Journalism, advertising, and business management might represent such loose patterns of preparation. On the other hand, a number of programs involve building and equipping of specialized facilities, the employment of teachers with particular training and experience, and continuous relationships with advisory committees. Dental assisting, aeronautics, garment manufacture, and metallurgical technology represent these highly structured programs. Briefly, then, the various occupational curricula encompass the applied and graphic arts; business and commerce; agriculture, horticulture and forestry; the skilled trades and crafts; the science and engineering technologies, and health, governmental, recreation, and other services.

It is increasingly inappropriate to refer to these technical-vocational programs as terminal education. In actual practice many students seek or are offered employment before completing the planned sequence of work. A great number, however, return for additional study in the extended day programs and ultimately earn a certificate of completion or the associate in arts degree. If present predictions are valid, most employed persons in our society will need extensive retraining several times during their working careers. At present, California Junior Colleges play the major role in the training and retraining of California's skilled labor force. Because of this fact California is well ahead of any other state in the number of preparatory trade and industrial offerings and in technology curricula offered under Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act. Even though empirical evidence is lacking, it appears that California's remarkable economic development and its singular contribution to modern technology are in part the result of the availability and quality of occupational education in its public Junior Colleges.

The State requires that a Junior College major include at least 20 units of appropriate course work. In practice, however, there is great pressure to add courses to the major which consequently reduces the opportunity for general education. It is true, nevertheless, that the Junior Colleges have been quite successful in reducing the hours spent in manipulative activities. There has been a steady upgrading of the occupational programs with increased emphasis on technical knowledge and mathematical and communication skills. One consequence of this change has been the increase in prerequisite courses and the development of appropriate service courses. These changes reflect the fact that work in our society is becoming more cognitive. In general, the Junior Colleges are giving increased emphasis to preparation for a family of occupations rather than to specific preparation for an entry job.

Junior Colleges have attempted to confront the dual purposes of vocational education—to train skilled workers and to educate the students they serve. The colleges have done so primarily by seeking to give equal status to vocational and liberal education. They have been only partially successful in doing so. Existing studies show that faculties are divided regarding the importance of vocational education and particularly as to what programs should be offered. It is important to note, nevertheless, that vocational instructors are well integrated into Junior College faculties although they frequently have different reference groups from teachers in the more traditionally academic fields. It is these reference groups—professional societies, university peers, labor organizations—which influence attitudes about who should be educated and how. These different points of view can be strengths, but the education of skilled and semiprofessional workers in a comprehensive community college is possible only if all segments of a faculty can work together toward common institutional goals. To give a specific example, if the liberal arts instructors are not willing or able to provide effective remedial courses in language, mathematics, and study skills, actual and potential vocational students will be *pushed* out of the Junior Colleges. (Push-outs are often referred to as drop-outs.) Or if liberal education continues to be confused with introductory preparation for advanced study, it will remain irrelevant to a majority of Junior College students and discourage their continuation in programs designed to prepare them to live, as well as to work. These issues seem directly related to the problem of attracting students to a number of vocational programs. In spite of the fact that 75% of Junior College students are not now transferring to four-year institutions, only one-third are in occupation-centered programs. The Junior College record in working with the "latent terminal" student still leaves something to be desired. To be sure the reluctance on the part of many students to choose vocational programs reflects the status values of society. For the student there are many clues regarding the status of various programs, including the attitudes of teachers toward those programs.

The new national concern for both technical-vocational education and education for the culturally disadvantaged should bring new vigor to the traditional Junior College commitment to serve those students who are unable or do not seek to transfer. There are, however, counter influences which are discussed through this report. The issue, then, is whether Junior College people and those who help guide their institutions will persevere in redefining what is college level education in the light of legitimate and known needs of students not served by the other segments of higher education. In addition to federal stimulation and resources there are encouraging events at the local levels which are bringing strength to technical-vocational education. Several districts have completed studies which should guide them in developing regional cooperation in the use of resources, facilities, and faculties in serving youth and adults. A related development is the formation of multi-campus districts which enhanced resources for vocational education. As these changes take place colleges will have the assistance of such facilities as the Center for the Study of Vocational Education at the University of California.

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

The Educational Policies Commission's recent call for universal higher education which "frees the mind" comes at a time of near demise of viable programs of general education in American colleges and universities. Furthermore, in spite of the dramatic diversity in student bodies at these some 2,000 institutions there appears to be a steady movement toward similarity in their curricula. This, too, in spite of the strong evidence that students who are different should be educated differently.

Most of the great experiments in general education are but memories, and the use of introductory courses for the several disciplines is now near universal in meeting general education requirements. Such is the picture of general education in California Junior Colleges, as well, with but few exceptions. In spite of the talk and catalogue claims it is difficult to report more than minimum commitment to general education in 1964. Again part of the problem has been the difficulty in getting experimental and unconventional courses accepted for transfer. Nevertheless, several Junior Colleges have been able to surmount this problem by the quality of their new courses and persistent articulation efforts. There appear to be more basic factors which have contributed to the gap between Junior College claims and practices in providing meaningful general education for all students. Among them are:

(1) An increasing number of Junior College teachers see themselves as specialists and are unable or unwilling to teach courses with conceptual objectives which cut through the walls between subjects. Furthermore, some of them may not have been exposed to great courses in the liberal arts and sciences in their own educations.

(2) With the present emphasis on making undergraduate studies primarily preparation for graduate education, introductory courses in the disciplines tend to emphasize methodology and fail to touch students with modest academic and intellectual interests.

(3) General education courses are taught predominately by the lecture method. The result is frequent alienation of those many students who are neither verbally nor intellectually oriented but who need teaching which motivates and arouses curiosity.

(4) The claims for general education have been too grandiose and comprehensive. Courses which should be designed to develop interests in and powers to pursue life-long learning should not be the patent medicine of education.

In its 1964 publication, *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School,* the Educational Policies Commission places this problem within the context of all higher education.

> As more students continue their education beyond the high school, the need for motivating students and the difficulty of doing it increase. For most students the rational powers develop best under guidance and example of an expert, responsive, flexible teacher who is himself committed to the search for truth. . . . Therefore, nonselective colleges will, for the forseeable fu-

> ture, need many teachers dedicated less to creation of specialists and more to the advancement of each student regardless of his ability—less to the student already interested in the teacher's particular specialty than to students whose interest in the general field need to be aroused.[2]

In California Junior Colleges there are some very exciting courses and programs with life-long learning as their goals. There is also mounting evidence that students of varying abilities and motivations can be reached and changed as a result of college experiences in and out of the classroom. It would seem, then, that a professional attack on the problem of relevant general education is long overdue in Junior College education. This problem is at the heart of the issue of who is to be educated.

EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

There are those who believe that the pressing demands of contemporary society cannot wait for the abilities and leadership of young men and women now in school. They would advocate a great push in adult education, not only to provide the retraining needed for employment, but to help develop knowledge and judgment about the great issues of the day.

The extent to which Junior Colleges serve California adults is impressive indeed. In the fall 1963 there were 239,787 part-time students and 156,574 "defined adults"[3] in graded classes. In addition there were a total of 66,784 students in classes for adults, or ungraded classes. It is difficult to make much sense out of these data since the traditional concepts of adult education or evening education no longer apply in Junior Colleges. Many full-time students take courses in the evening, and a large percentage of students in the day are part-time. Furthermore, "adults" are identified primarily for record keeping purposes rather than because of their choice of programs. In order to understand the Junior College role in continuing education it is necessary to examine recent State measures to differentiate functions among the various segments of public education and to support education for adults.

On February 14, 1963, the State Board of Education established criteria and standards for graded Junior College classes. This decision followed several years of concern among legislators about standards in Junior College and State College classes for adults, and about what appeared to be wasteful overlapping among the institutions which provided education for adults. The 1959 legislative session called for an investigation of adult education which was later conducted by the Assembly Interim Committee on Education. Since the Committee defined adult education so as to include all part-time education for adults regardless of educational level, it looked into the extension services of the University of California, the extension services and extended day program of the State Colleges, the extended day and adult education programs of Junior Colleges, and the high school adult education programs.

In general the Committee supported the Governor's earlier recommendation to reduce State support for adult education. It further directed the Coordinating Council to recommend ways of reducing the competition among the various institutions. These and related recommendations concerning the delineation of functions, coordination, and financing of continuing education programs were forwarded to the Legislature in 1963.[4] In the meantime the State Department of Education with the cooperation of the California Junior College Association and other groups submitted to the State Board recommended definitions of "graded" and "ungraded" classes. These criteria went through some 16 drafts before being adopted. In general terms a graded class must have been approved by the State Board of Education and have one or more of the following characteristics: 1) be of college level and provide prerequisite, component, or elective credit toward an associate-in-arts degree; 2) be part of a "beyond high school" vocational or technical program leading toward an associate in arts degree and/or an occupational certificate; 3) be recognized by accredited colleges and universities in California as part of a required preparation toward a major, or as required or permissive general education and/or elective studies.

The State Board also adopted standards for such graded classes which include procedures for course approval, length of course of study, qualifications of students admitted to courses, and for the grading and evaluation of these students. It is likely that these regulations have speeded the general trend toward making continuing education in Junior Colleges more traditionally academic, but at the same time they have eliminated some courses of doubtful standards and appropriateness.

Of equal importance to the future of continuing education is the level of State support for adults attending Junior Colleges. The amount of State equalization aid is computed differently for those defined as adults. In defining adults as students over 21 enrolled in less than 10 units, it was the intent of the Legislature to provide less State support for adult education. In reference to Junior Colleges this is accomplished by lower apportionment for adult a.d.a. than for non-adult a.d.a. In 1964 the foundation program for non-adult a.d.a. was $600, but for adult a.d.a. it was only $490 with a maximum entitlement of $230. This difference takes on special importance in view of the fact that the cost of graded classes is considerably higher than the cost of non-graded classes, and that there are three times as many "adult" students in graded as compared with non-graded classes. The result is a significant reduction in the level of State support for the entire Junior College program. Consequently, it is the recommendation of most leaders that State aid for "defined adults" be the same as for minors. If this were done, the overall level of State support for Junior Colleges would be substantially increased.

---

[2] P. 14.

[3] Any student who has attained his twenty-first birthday on or before February 1 who has enrolled in fewer than 10 class hours.

[4] See CCHE, ***Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education***, #1005, (Sacramento and San Francisco, July 1963), 45 pp.

The problem of support cannot be separated from the larger issue of how well Junior Colleges will serve the continuing education needs of their communities. It would seem that the race to replace "adult" education with degree, transfer, and employment-oriented education would conflict with the growing educational needs associated with leisure and self-improvement. The Legislature may be right that such services are the responsibility of local communities. If so, it would seem important to reduce the heavy load on the local taxpayer for education of adults in graded classes. At present there are no adequate studies to show the impact of these changing attitudes about and regulations for the education of adults in Junior Colleges. As has been noted, there is an accelerated shift toward graded classes, but at the same time Junior Colleges are making greater use of the community service tax for cultural activities. It may be that these colleges, through community service programs and through comprehensive offerings throughout the extended day, will find a better pattern of serving adults than represented by more traditional adult education. Nevertheless, a major issue must be faced: What effect will the new orientation of Junior Colleges to higher education have on their programs of continuing education?

REMEDIAL EDUCATION

The Junior Colleges have traditionally attempted to educate all students who entered their open doors. Over the years this has meant much experimentation in curriculum and teaching methods. In brief, these efforts have had as their goals the development of academic skills and motivation in students who seek another chance in college. No other segment of higher education has accepted such a challenge, and there are those who counsel the Junior Colleges to give up these "less than college" level activities. Unfortunately this counsel comes at a time when our society is beginning to attack the problems of training the untrained and educating the under-educated. By tradition and by defined responsibility the Junior Colleges should lead this attack. In any case, if the Junior Colleges are to provide technical-vocational education at a level different from the other segments of higher education; if they are to help remedy deficiencies in students with the potential of continuing their educations, there seems to be no alternative but to take students where they are and to give them the means to develop capacities and interests. This is not a matter of sentimentality nor is it a call to indulge those students who will not achieve. It *is* a call for appropriate courses taught by teachers who care and who have professional skills needed in this most difficult area of teaching.

THE REDEFINITION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

What is taught in the first two years of college has undergone profound changes since the founding of the denominational colleges of the early American colonies. The changes have involved both the level at which certain disciplines are to be taught and the very nature of the offerings themselves. For example, there has been a steady movement of "college level" work into the secondary schools, or as more frequently noted, college standards have been raised over the decades. Equally fundamental changes have resulted from the ever-expanding realm of human knowledge and the acceptability of certain fields of knowledge within hallowed halls. It is scarcely a century since the natural sciences became respectable enough to be included in the curriculum, and the social sciences are of even more recent vintage.

College curricula have also been influenced by a mythology which seeks to distinguish the so-called pure or theroretical fields from the applied. It is likely that some such dimensions exist at the scholarly levels of academe, but the dividing line is illusive indeed. At the introductory levels of knowledge it is likely that all subjects are applied—and furthermore vocational in any meaningful sense of the word. For example, the introductory course in chemistry is as functional to the career of the chemist as typing is to the career of the secretary. In any case, the courses in our early colleges were explicity practical and had as their goals the education of gentlemen.

As Americans moved west to conquer the continent they took their colleges with them, and these colleges changed as the people's needs changed. Now they needed trained farmers and skilled workers as well as gentlemen. Later they needed scientists and scholars and technicians. Each of these great changes in American society have been marked by changes in the college curriculum. The land grant colleges brought education to the farms and to the new industrial communities, and new programs were created to deal with their fertile land and their machines. Then at the turn of the century the inventiveness and curiosity of the age gave stimulation to the new universities which have since brought us so swiftly into the atomic age and helped build a society of unequalled abundance. These changes were accompanied by true revolutions in what was to be taught in our colleges, and how it was to be taught.

Social changes of unequalled magnitude have been entwined with and stimulated by these technical-scientific revolutions. From all segments of American society have come demands for education and training beyond the high school. These demands are being met to a degree unknown in any other civilization or society. Today the most compelling response to these demands for education is the rapid development of people's colleges.

These summary comments seem necessary because of some damaging myths about what is college level work and what is not. For example:

> *Myth 1.* Only those courses which are recognized by universities for transfer purposes are "college level."
>
> *Myth 2.* There is some sort of absolute standard for college courses which is determined by the nature of the subject taught, and which can be readily determined and applied regardless of the students being taught.
>
> *Myth 3.* Education for immediate employment is somehow less collegiate than education for work which requires transfer to another institution.

Other myths also clutter up discussions about what should be taught in Junior Colleges. This in spite of the fact that the most compelling insight which comes from reading the history of American higher education is that which is taught in college is a matter of constant change and redefinition. Each new institution—the land grant colleges, the universities, the Junior Colleges—has defined curricula and standards in the light of pressing American needs. There are no absolutes: there are no inferior curricula except those which are badly taught.

The issue of what is to be taught in Junior Colleges is of particular urgency in 1964. There are those who see the Master Plan as a mandate to "raise standards" in Junior Colleges and to eliminate courses from the curriculum which are "less than college level." Although it is rarely done, both of these vague criteria need to be defined in a manner appropriate to Junior College education. The following ideas seem essential to these definitions:

> *Standards.* The only meaningful definition of "standards" in education is determined by the quality of teaching and the resources for learning. Badly taught courses have low standards whether they are at the freshmen or graduate levels. Excellently taught courses have high standards whether they are concerned with remedial English or quantum physics. There is no necessary relationship between high standards and the number of students who fail or who are forced to drop from a class.
>
> *College Level.* Those courses which concern themselves with the educational needs of young and mature adults as they prepare for advanced study, skilled work, or as they seek greater freedom and refinement of mind are of college level. In California such courses are to be determined by the characteristics of students who are to be educated in the various segments of a differentiated system of higher education. Certainly what is college level cannot be determined solely by the curriculum of the elite segment of that system or by the characteristics of its students.

It seems appropriate in summing up this discussion to point out that the quality of an institution is best judged by what it is able to accomplish with the students it accepts, rather than by its ability to attract high ability students. The Junior Colleges can compete on this basis since they are established to educate the other segments of higher education. Whether the Junior Colleges fully succeed or not depends to a great extent upon the relevance of their courses and their standards of teaching their heterogeneous students.

GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES: CHANGES AND CHALLENGES

The issue of how California Junior Colleges are to be governed is to a great extent an outgrowth of the problems of numbers. Expanding enrollments and budgets, the building of complete new campuses and facilities—all have brought changes to the internal structure of colleges and demands for new approaches to coordination and service at a statewide level. These actual and contemplated organizational changes have implications for all aspects of Junior College education. However, there are certain fundamental questions which seem particularly relevant to the three major areas of change. It is to these questions that the following sections are devoted. Does the trend toward large, regional, and multi-campus districts threaten the role of Junior Colleges as community institutions? What effect will the establishment of academic senates and formal faculty authority have on the comprehensive, open-door college? Will proposed legislative measures to provide more efficient coordination and development of the statewide system of Junior Colleges diminish or enhance the vitality of local control?

JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN TRANSITION

The movement toward independent Junior College districts, which began with the enabling legislation in 1921, has in recent years changed the structure and the character of Junior College education in California. This trend was particularly encouraged by the Legislature in 1961. A general policy has been established for the inclusion of all high school and unified districts within districts maintaining Junior College districts. Furthermore, no districts except independent Junior College districts may now be formed to provide Junior College education. In general this trend, which is shown in Table 9, has resulted from the increasing identification of Junior Colleges with higher education and the resulting wish to be independent of the elementary and secondary schools. But equally important have been the need and the demands for Junior Colleges to achieve greater efficiency in the development and use of financial resources, utilization of staff and facilities, and in general management.

TABLE 9

Changing Patterns of Junior Colleges District Reorganization

Year	*Independent District*	*High School District*	*Unified District*
1960	28	16	12
1961	39	9	12
1963	48	5	11
1964	56	2	8

The rapid movement toward independence, however, has been accompanied by considerable growth in the size of districts. At present six Junior College districts are county-wide and four more are nearly so. Furthermore, four additional districts include substantial portions of two or more counties. This change in district organization recently led a spokesman from the Office of the Legislative Analyst to say in testimony before the Senate Sub-committee on Higher Education:

> . . . As these districts continue to grow in territory and population served, it becomes increasingly difficult to think of them as community institutions which are closely guided by local voters rather than as large autonomous districts, relatively independent in relation to the individual communities which they encompass.

The diminishing of local identity and service must be examined as a possible consequence of bigness. Certainly trustees in this new type of district represent different communities, and central administration must seek compromises among the competing demands from campuses within the district. But there are counter trends to this apparent loss of community identity.

Present practices in California's multiple-campus districts and the philosophy which is beginning to take shape place great emphasis on the autonomy of individual campuses and their responsiveness to the special characteristics of their local communities. Furthermore, there may be new resources and staff available to identify and respond to community needs. In this regard it seems likely that the freeing of local leadership from major responsibilities for fiscal and facilities management of districts may give a substantial boost to the community college concept. Junior Colleges have grown rapidly and have achieved status under a system of local autonomy. It remains to be seen whether the present trend toward large regional districts will enhance or threaten this tradition.

Very little is known about the relationship between district organization and the achievement of Junior College goals. Such studies are long overdue. There is evidence, however, that faculty and administrative attitudes toward the objectives and practices of the comprehensive, open-door college vary with the pattern of institutional organization. This may result in part from the fact that large independent Junior Colleges increasingly employ teachers who are subject matter specialists. Quite apart from the merits of such specialization, it appears that many of these teachers are more interested in their disciplines than in contributing to the community functions of the college or in experimenting with less conventional methods of reaching a large number of Junior College youth who don't really know what it means to be a student and who place little value on intellectual activity. What influence this faculty orientation will have on educational policy is unclear, but we can already find an English department which refuses to teach remedial English and a faculty which prides itself on grading more rigorously than the University of California. The point, of course, is that legislation and policy decisions which change the structure and personnel of Junior Colleges may also alter the colleges' character and objectives. Therefore, decisions about district structure and governance should always be tested against the purposes of Junior College education.

THE SHARING OF AUTHORITY

There has long been a sharing of responsibilities in the determination of policies within some Junior Colleges, but this partnership has been a sometimes thing and has lacked formal sanctions. Under law the Legislature has delegated to elected trustees of Junior College districts broad residual power for determining and executing policy. This authority has then been delegated, in part, to professional administrators who are held directly responsible for the consequences of their actions. In California no school official has tenure as a result of his administrative status. The third source of authority in college governance rests with the faculties. However potent teachers may have been in influencing the formation of policy and either giving life to or burying policy decisions, their authority in California Junior Colleges has been informal, misunderstood, and without foundation in law. A major area for misunderstanding and partisanship has centered on the question of whether authority could be delegated to teachers, since apparently concomitant responsibility could not be. Such doubts seem to rest on the assumption that tenure is the measure of responsibility and to deny the profound responsibility of teachers in student welfare and professional matters. In reality teachers pay the consequences of their actions when they are evaluated by students, colleagues, and to a degree by the community they serve. Unfortunately, the latter point is somewhat of a cliché since the role of teacher has not been closely associated with educational leadership until recently. Today marks a change in the role of Junior College teachers and the governance of colleges in which they teach.

All the participants in this move toward collegiality—legislators, trustees, administrators, and teachers—have sought some model which would be particularly appropriate for the community college. None seems quite right. Although a few faculty leaders continue to be attracted to the Academic Senate of the University of California and similar bodies, there is increasing awareness within faculty associations that Junior Colleges may need a more flexible and democratic organization for influencing policy. Furthermore, it seems to have come as a surprise to many of those caught up in the present debates on academic senates that the principle of faculty authority arrived very late on the American scene. The early American college and the contemporary public schools share a common heritage in matters of authority and control. The tradition is essentially bureaucratic and has been influenced by both ecclesiastic and business enterprise. It is only after the turn of the century that faculties gained increasing responsibility and authority in some colleges and universities. The principle of collegiality has slowly developed around the concepts of expertness and professional self-regulation. In brief, it means that decisions affecting complex and specialized fields of knowledge are to be made by those qualified as a result of prescribed education and experience. Organizationally this has resulted in growing emphasis on departmental authority and the development of academic senates concerned primarily with personnel matters and the advancement of academic freedom.

Several Junior College faculties had established effective councils for investigation of issues and recommending policy to their administrators and trustees prior to recent statewide efforts to establish academic senates. It was, however, the leadership of the Junior College Faculty Association and the American Federation of Teachers which achieved legislative action on this matter. It was clearly the intent of Assembly Resolution No. 48 to encourage the establishment of academic senates, and within a year the State Board of Education implemented the resolution by adding section 131.6 to Title 5 of the *California Administrative Code.* In brief, this section directs governing boards of each district to establish an academic senate or faculty council if requested by the faculty after it has voted by means of secret ballot. The consequences of this mandate may be profound, but the movement toward faculty authority has developed so rapidly that there has been little time to examine its meaning for Junior College objectives. There are, consequently, little empirical data to support the following observations.

It is likely that many administrators and trustees regret a State mandate in matters involving the internal organization and management of Junior Colleges. On the other hand, faculty association presidents, meeting at San Diego in October 1963, almost unanimously advocated the mandating of academic senates by the State Board of Education. It is interesting to note that CJCFA and AFT leaders have consistently sought State involvement and action in matters which traditionally have been local responsibilities. This philosophy was clearly stated in a July 1964 position paper by the CJCFA. "From the point of view of the Faculty Association most of the real gains in junior college education have come through legislation." Understandably, organized faculty groups find it easier to deal with the Legislature and the State Board of Education than they do with sixty-six local boards which have shown no marked sympathy toward *formal* faculty involvement in policy formation. In spite of these different orientations to college governance, there has been diversity of opinion on the issue of academic senates *within* each group—faculty, administrators, and trustees. Debate on the role of Junior College teachers in policy formation has been intense but remarkably mature. As a result, in submitting his report regarding ACR 48 for consideration by the State Board of Education, the Chief of the Bureau of Junior College Education was able to conclude: "We have presented recommendations that the vast majority of teachers, administrators, and governing boards would find workable and acceptable realizing at the same time that they may not be completely acceptable to anyone."

In adopting an emergency regulation so that academic senates or faculty councils could become fully effective for the 1964–65 school year the State Board of Education defined such a body as an organization "whose primary function is, as the representative of the faculty, to make recommendations to the administration and the governing board of a school district with respect to academic and professional matters." As has been suggested, the establishment, composition, structure, and procedures of such organizations are to be determined by secret and democratic election procedures. The State Board also attempted to resolve what had become topics of intense differences of opinion within Junior Colleges. It decided that, "'Faculty' means those certificated persons who teach full-time in a Junior College or other full-time certificated persons who do not perform any services for the college that require an administrative or supervisory credential." And secondly, although a senate or council is to present written views and recommendations, to the governing board through regularly established channels, the faculty body "after consultation with the administration, may present its views and recommendations directly to the governing board."

A 1964 study of Junior College faculty associations shows that the establishment of academic senates or faculty councils represent their first order of business. Actually, several senates or councils have now been established, are functioning, and formally recognized by their college trustees. It may be to the interest of these organizations and to Junior College education that there is no compelling model for formal faculty authority. Consequently, there should be a great deal of experimentation as trustees, administrators, and faculty learn to share power and responsibility. It seems clear, however, that the committee structure in many Junior Colleges will be changed with senate committees either replacing or working tangent to the more traditional advisory committees.

It might be well to describe the committee structure of a recently established faculty senate to illustrate this point and to show the inclusiveness of faculty involvement in policy formation. (These functions have been taken from the by-laws for the faculty senate of a northern California Junior College.)

> *Professional Personnel Policies Committee.* This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on such matters as recruiting, selection, evaluation, assignment, teaching loads, promotion, retention, tenure, sabbatical leave, credential requirements, and accreditation of certified personnel.
>
> *Student Personnel Policies Committee.* This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on such matters as conduct, discipline, probation, inter and intra-college activities, scholarships, student loans, student government, out-of-district students, bookstore, and cafeteria.
>
> *Instruction Committee.* This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on such matters as curriculum, admissions, honors, degree requirements, retention of students, library and audio-visual center, development and maintenance of instructional facilities, college goals and objectives.
>
> *Finance Committee.* This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on all matters pertaining to college finance.

The great experiment is underway and there will continue to be debate about the implications of the new faculty role for Junior College objectives and for the big questions about who gets educated and how? There are those who see bleak years ahead as faculty oligarchies become entrenched and resistant to change. Others predict that the "academic" teachers will dominate the senates and pressure local boards and State agencies to modify the open-door policy of California Junior Colleges. And certainly there is fear that chronic conflicts of authority will make it difficult for Junior Colleges to respond to the changing needs of communities and the nation. Each of these predictions might come to pass, of course, but they seem to deny the essential good judgment of Junior College personnel and the tradition of cooperation upon which this new structure is being built. It seems far more likely that faculty nagging at some programs and services which are uniquely those of the Junior College will give way to responsible investigation of the needs for such programs. What at times have appeared to be negative positions by some faculties may be replaced by positive and professional programs for doing the job that must be done and doing it well. In summation, it seems likely that California Junior Colleges have immeasurably strengthened the means by which they may arrive at intelligent decisions at a time of crisis in education. The professional knowledge and experience of teachers should enhance the dedication and institutional view which characterize many Junior College administrators and trustees. The going may be tough, but those who are concerned with the continued development of an institution which is something other than a reflection of univeristy education might appreciate this new vitality at the local level rather than interfere with it.

STATE DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION

Although guided, and to an increasing extent directed by statute, the Junior Colleges of California have been created, operated, and, in large part, supported locally. At the State level it has been the Legislature's responsibility to establish statewide policies for the governance of the Junior Colleges by local boards and to designate those State agencies responsible for seeing that these policies are carried out and for serving the local districts. The Office of the Legislative Analyst has recently summed up this division of responsibilities.

> Aside from making provisions for the appropriation and proper allocation of state subventions, existing legislation is confined largely to six areas: the composition, powers and duties of local governing boards; procedure for district formation and organization; property management; district taxation and bonding; teacher cre-

dentialing; admission; and, to a much lesser extent, the broad structure of the junior college educational program. Other major areas such as curricula, salaries and personnel policies, expenditure control, academic and facility planning, and instructional standards have been left to the individual district governing boards.

The accretion of statutory guidelines has become increasingly disturbing to those who must direct the development and operation of Junior Colleges. As of 1964 there were at least 150 sections of the *Education Code* which were concerned with Junior College matters. They represent a strange mixture of major policy statutes and almost trivial mandates. But even more numerous are the rules and regulations under Title V of the *Administrative Code*. Here are found the policies of the State Board of Education which has the responsibility of prescribing minimum standards for the formation and operation of public Junior Colleges and for exercising general supervision over them. The Board has chosen to limit its supervisory role except when specifically directed to do otherwise by statute or legislative resolution.

The bureaucratic web has become most unmanageable in the areas of policy advice and execution. The one agency of State government most responsible for the Junior Colleges, the State Department of Education, has so split its administrative responsibility among its own administrative hierarchy that it is seemingly impossible for it to adequately serve or make coordinated policy decisions affecting the Junior Colleges. Specifically, there are nearly twenty bureaus or agencies of the Department which have connection with or responsibilities for Junior Colleges. Within this complex the Bureau of Junior College Education has neither the status nor the staff to bring order out of these overlapping and uncoordinated activities.

The full complexity of State responsibilities becomes apparent with a comment about some of the other agencies and commissions which concern themselves with Junior College matters.

> *The State Department of Finance* has great influence since it may (1) include funds within the Governor's budget for both operating and capital expenses for Junior Colleges over and above those required by statute; (2) work with legislators to obtain separate legislation authorizing increased financial assistance; (3) actively oppose any financial increases at all, and (4) remain neutral regarding financial proposals.
>
> *The Coordinating Council for Higher Education* has the responsibility for developing plans for the orderly growth of public higher education, including Junior Colleges. By its studies and recommendations it may influence both State and local policies regarding all aspects of Junior College education.
>
> *The State Department of Public Works* is responsible for reviewing the architectural plans of, and final constructional approval of, Junior College facilities.
>
> *The Office of the Legislative Analyst* has the power to make specific recommendations regarding all aspects of Junior College education, but in particular curriculum, finances, and facilities construction.
>
> *The California Scholarship Commission* may have influence regarding the flow of scholarship students to public Junior Colleges.

There is no responsible person in California who is prepared to defend the status quo regarding State direction and supervision of Junior College education. It is somewhat embarrassing, however, while examining the neater, more centralized, and formally coordinated systems in Florida, Arizona, or Massachusetts to realize that the Junior Colleges have flourished most fully in California. There is something of value in the loosely coordinated system which must be identified and preserved. On the other hand it is probably fair to conclude that California's Junior Colleges have thrived in spite of the complexity of statewide activities rather than because of it. Alternatives are now being debated. The decisions which must be made will have profound influence on whether there is to be orderly development and adequate support for Junior Colleges in the coming years. In the long run, of course, the viability of California's *diverse* system of public higher education is at stake.

THE ROLE OF ASSOCIATIONS

In the absence of substantial leadership at the State level, important roles have been played by unofficial organizations in bringing about cooperation and coordination among the increasing number of Junior Colleges. The more influential of these organizations are the Junior College section of the California School Board Association, the recently formed California Junior College Faculty Association, the California Teachers Association, and especially, the California Junior College Association (CJCA). Over the years this latter association has become a semi-official coordinating and policy-making body. Although it could never speak authoritatively for the Junior College system, the CJCA—which primarily represented Junior College administrators—was notably successful in influencing legislation and in sharing methods of solving problems.

The growth and new status of the two-year colleges in recent years has greatly changed the CJCA and modified its effectiveness as an informal coordinating agency. With the increased militancy of faculty groups—particularly the California Junior College Faculty Association—and the demand of trustees for greater involvement in statewide activities, the CJCA in 1961 underwent a major reorganization. On paper the changes promise much-needed revitalization of the Association and the continuation of its leadership in Junior College affairs. In reality, however, there is yet no precedent, no articulate plan for welding faculty leaders, trustees, and administrators into an effective organization. The need for such a viable association is great if the Junior Colleges are to remain primarily community-centered institutions. It seems important, therefore, to look briefly at the present structure of the Association.

Much of the work of the California Junior College Association is accomplished through committees, however, the Board of Directors has great influence since it must implement policy, act on behalf of the Association, and cooperate with public and private agencies concerned with Junior College education. The 1963 membership of the Board and the several committees indicates the broadening of participation in the Association, but it also shows that it is not yet adequately representative.

California Junior College Association

Body	*Faculty*	*Administrators*	*Trustees*
Board of Directors *	7	14	1
Committees **			
Athletics	4	6	0
Finance and Legislation	1	9	0
Articulation	0	10	0
Curriculum & Instruction	4	7	0
Guidance & Student Pers.	3	9	0
Continuing Education	0	5	0
Accreditation	0	5	0
Student Government	0	4	0
Nominations	0	3	0
Moral & Spiritual Values	3	6	0
Nursing Education	0	6	0
Public Relations	2	6	0
Real Estate Education	3	8	0
Voc-Technical Education	1	7	0
Attendance & Enrollment	1	7	0

* The Board of Directors also includes 3 persons in other categories.
** Special committees and articulation conference committees are shown.

The lack of trustee representation may be misleading since trustees are members of the California School Boards Association; but in light of the increasing advocacy of their active involvement in CJCA, it would appear that they should be brought into working relationships with faculty members and administrators. Faculty representatives have been brought into leadership positions primarily in the regional associations. But even if the regions are to develop vigorous associations it would seem necessary for the statewide organization to be fully representative. It should be stressed, again, that the CJCA is an organization in transition, and it has begun to make progress in tapping resources from all segments of the Junior College movement.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE STATUS QUO

The debate on alternatives to the present structure of State policy direction and supervision has been rather low keyed, and there has been persistent counsel from a wide range of Junior College leaders against premature decisions. The Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education has begun a series of hearings on the relationship of the public Junior Colleges to the State Board of Education and to the State Department of Education. It seems important to look at the major alternatives which are being considered and the support they have from various groups.

Consolidation of Services Within the State Department of Education. It is obvious that responsibility for Junior College education within the Department is widely distributed among the several divisions and bureaus. Better coordination in departmental service and supervision might be achieved by their consolidation. Based in part on a major study for the reorganization of the Department, the Superintendent of Public Instruction has announced that such consolidation of services under the present Division of Higher Education is under way. In spite of the fact that consolidation is long overdue, this *fait accompli* may be unfortunate in view of the Stiern Committee hearings and the recommendations which have already been made by such groups as the California Junior College Association and the California Junior College Faculty Association. There is serious question, furthermore, as to the nature of this reorganization. For example, Junior College presidents were recently impressed when assured by the Associate Superintendent that the new "Division of Higher Education Services" would be primarily concerned with Junior College matters and would have adequate staff to serve the colleges and to provide experienced leadership in the relationships with other state organizations. At the Fresno conference of the CJCA on October 28, 1964, however, the Superintendent dismissed the idea of anything other than sectional status for Junior College activities. In light of these events it seems appropriate to report the essential positions of several groups regarding this alternative of Departmental reorganization:

> We believe the size and scope of junior college activities in California public higher education fully justify establishing in the Department a Division of Junior College Education whose chief would have cabinet rank. This officer should be a person with broad junior college experience, both in the classroom and as an administrator. The association has advocated this type of organization for a decade or more. . . . We believe that all Department staff members whose duties relate to junior colleges should be brought together in this proposed division. . . . To put this sugges-

tion differently, we believe that all relationships of any junior college and the Department of Education should be centered in this new division. . . . Though it is essential and most desirable that junior colleges should remain primarily community-centered institutions under the control of local governing boards, some degree of coordination is necessary especially as regards junior college relations with the University of California, California State Colleges, and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The proposed division organization would provide experienced leadership in the relationships with those other organizations.

President, California Junior College Association, July 10, 1964

Better coordination in departmental supervision might be achieved by their consolidation if this can be accomplished. It is questionable, however, whether such action would assure better leadership or simply result in some improvement in coordination within the department and continuation of its essentially passive role. Because we have been able to find little continuity or clarity of purpose in recent budgetary requests by the department to augment the Bureau of Junior Colleges, we have opposed such requests and have recommended that the department first prepare a plan indicating the proposed role of the department and the board in providing more effective services and leadership for the junior colleges.

Office of the Legislative Analyst
July 10, 1964

Support the re-organization of the State Department of Education to center junior college affairs in one office. (Recommendation, the 1965 Legislative Program of CJCA)

Chairman, Finance and Legislative Committee, October 28, 1964

The State Department of Education has only a small staff devoting itself to junior college education. It appears that the routine of junior college business consumes the available time of the staff and there is little time for creative thinking and planning which will enable junior college educators throughout the state to do better what they are doing well today and to develop new programs and new goals *as* they become feasible, not twenty years after. . . . We would propose then that a separate board for junior college education be established, that it simply take over the powers which the present state board now has for junior college education, and that it be given funds for a somewhat enlarged staff to enable it to study and solve some of the problems . . . not previously taken on.

President, California Junior College Faculty Association, July 10, 1964

Establishment of a State Board for Junior College Education. There is general recognition that the present State Board of Education has been unable to give adequate attention to Junior College matters. This is not due to lack of interest on the part of board members but to the magnitude of problems which face elementary, secondary, and Junior College education. The legislative advocate for the CJCA recalls a recent meeting of the Board with an agenda of forty-one separate items. "Junior College financing, the only agenda item that affected the Junior Colleges, was number forty." The establishment of a State Board of Junior College Education is being advocated as a means of filling the void in statewide leadership which now exists for the Junior Colleges.

It is likely that rather fundamental differences in beliefs about the nature of Junior College education underlie either advocacy or rejection of this proposal for a separate board. Those who believe that the genius of the Junior College movement in California rests in the community college concept are cautious about making organizational changes at the State level. It is likely that most Junior College trustees and administrators are of this conviction and prefer to retain at the local level responsibilities and leadership which some would centralize in a new State agency. These leaders recognize that Junior Colleges must have a stronger voice before the Legislature, but they would see this as best accomplished by reorganizing the present Department of Education and by strengthening the California Junior College Association. On the other hand a number of faculty representatives, and especially the leaders of the Faculty Association, would turn more readily to State leadership in dealing with Junior College problems. As has been pointed out, they believe that most Junior College advances have come from State action and that the welfare of teachers is best assured through strong State supervision.

The following issues are among those which the CJCFA believes should be considered by a State Board of Junior College Education. There is no way of knowing how many teachers would feel that their own freedoms as well as those of local colleges might be compromised by State control in a number of these areas.

1. Proper level of financing at both the State and local levels.
2. Mandatory formation of independent Junior College Districts.
3. Establishment of quality control by some form of statewide testing.

4. Implementation of the academic senates in policy making structure of the Junior Colleges.
5. Importance of academic freedom to the community.
6. Encouragement of an exchange teacher program within the Junior Colleges and perhaps the State Colleges.
7. Modification of the sabbatical leave program to bring it more in line with other institutions of higher education.
8. Clarification of the role of the Junior College both with respect to secondary education and to higher education.
9. Evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the present accreditation program.
10. Consideration of program for statewide tenure at the Junior College level.
11. Increased cooperation between neighboring Junior Colleges in providing a rich curriculum. Also increased cooperation between State Colleges and Junior Colleges to avoid wasteful competition.

Some interest in a separate board comes from the fact that a number of other states have established or are considering centralized approaches to the development of Junior College systems. Certainly these patterns of State organization should be studied, but in doing so they should be appraised in light of the educational history and needs of particular states. The needs of Arizona, Oregon, or Massachusetts, for example, are quite unlike those of California which has already developed the nation's most extensive and distinguished program of Junior College education. Studies of State organizations show no patterns which are particularly appropriate for California with its extensive system of diversified public higher education. Within this system a high level of coordination of programs, resources, capital development, and flow of students is called for. It may, therefore, be necessary to have a State agency which can strengthen the voice of the Junior Colleges before the Legislature and in matters of articulation. Since such proposals threaten to divide the Junior College family, it is likely that some compromise will be adopted.

Creation of a Consultative Commission. One alternative to continued State passivity in Junior College governance on the one hand and centralization as represented by a separate State board on the other is the creation of a special consultative commission to advise and assist the State Board of Education in all matters pertaining to the Junior Colleges. The Office of the Legislative Analyst made the following analysis of this alternative in testimony before a recent hearing of a Senate Subcommittee.

> This would be, in effect, a separate but subordinate board made up of representatives of the interested junior college parties. Presumably the department staff concerned with junior college matters would operate as the commission's staff. Presumably, also, the board would rely heavily, if not entirely, upon the advice and recommendations of such a commission while retaining formally its over-all responsibility. In this manner a separate board would be created in fact but without explicit recognition and without clear accountability.

As yet there is no widespread support for such a commission, and there is some concern that it would add still another voice and another level of bureaucracy to an already confusing situation. It is possible, however, that such a commission might be the means of focusing the increasing diversity of positions on Junior College matters into an acceptable plan for long-range development.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

If the issue of Junior College governance is to be resolved wisely, answers will be needed for a number of questions. Although hearings like those conducted by Senator Stiern and conferences like that for which this report has been prepared[5] will help provide answers, it is essential that long-range appraisals of State organizational patterns be made. By whatever method answers to the following questions are arrived at, it is imperative that they be consistent with the essential goal of providing education for students not served at all or not as well served by the other segments of higher education in California.

(1) With minor reorganization is the present State structure adequate for providing supervision, long-range planning and representation for the Junior Colleges?

(2) What is the proper balance between district autonomy and central authority in such matters as curriculum, admission and retention, academic standards, personnel policies, and the determination of current and capital expenditures?

(3) Can the Junior Colleges play their full role as a segment of California's system of public higher education as envisaged by the Master Plan and at the same time maintain their pluralistic and loosely coordinated pattern of control and representation?

(4) Would the strengthening of centralized, statewide administration lead to the weakening of the community college concept and the autonomy of local districts?

---

[5] See Section IV.

(5) Is the diversity of positions on Junior College issues a strength or weakness? What are the proper limitations of centralized authority in the managing of collegial affairs?

THE FACULTIES AND THEIR STANDARDS

California Junior Colleges have gained a substantial reputation for the quality of their teaching and, particularly in recent years, for their administrative leadership in developing new and changing institutions. Today, new roles and responsibilities are imminent for each group as a result of both statutes and the changing nature of internal and statewide governance. In the process of examining the factors which influence the performance and standards of Junior College teachers and administrators it is possible to identify a number of issues which are important to the future development of community college education in California.

THE TEACHING FACULTIES

Junior College teachers have many characteristics which they share in common with those who teach in other institutions of higher education, but there are factors which set them apart from their peers. Among these latter factors are the conditions under which they teach, their educational qualifications, and the sources from which they come. In addition there are laws and traditions which influence the status and role of community college teachers. Among the major sources of data for this chapter are the recent Coordinating Council investigation of faculty opinion, the California State College at Los Angeles' study of new Junior College teachers, and Edinger's annual reports of newly employed Junior College teachers in California.

The public schools continue to provide most teachers for the two-year colleges, but decreasingly so. However, this last comment needs qualification since it would appear that in 1963 districts once again employed a high percentage of new teachers from secondary schools. In the early years of Junior College education, classes were taught almost exclusively by secondary teachers. The ratio of teachers from this source, however, has gradually dropped until by the five-year period ending in 1962 only about 30% of new teachers came directly from high schools or elementary schools. On the other hand, it appears that in 1962 over 40% of the new teachers were from public schools and in 1963 51% held secondary credentials. If this apparent change is true, it might reflect administrative concern about serving the majority of Junior College students who do not transfer to four-year colleges. From where, then, do the other faculty members come? Table 10 shows the approximate percentages from major sources as reported by the Coordinating Council.

TABLE 10

Institutions of Prior Appointment for California Junior College 1957–58 to 1961–62

Source	*Percentage*
Four-year College & Universities	17%
Junior Colleges	12
Graduate Schools	22
Non-academic Fields	16
High Schools	28
No response/Others	6

It is interesting to note the large percentage of new Junior College teachers who are now coming directly from graduate schools. Intensive experience with teachers of this calibre suggest that they are and will make a significant contribution to Junior College education. Nevertheless, their interests are frequently devoted more to teaching transfer students of high ability than to teaching the more typical Junior College student. It will be necessary, then, for colleges to give more importance to in-service training of new teachers.

The Junior Colleges have increasingly attracted teachers who have earned or are working toward graduate degrees. Although the master's degree is now held by most teachers, the percentage holding doctorates is about 10% and seems to be leveling off at that figure. Of the approximately 860 degree holders employed in 1961–62, 161 held undergraduate degrees, 646 master's, and 53 doctorates. The 1963 data also suggest a decline in the percentage of new doctorates with only 5½% of the new teachers holding this degree. The question of academic rank poses a different status problem for Junior College teachers. Because of the close association of the Junior Colleges with secondary schools and the frequent over-lapping of faculties, no professorial ranks were, until recently, considered appropriate for the two-year colleges. The closer identification with higher education in recent years has resulted in more attention to the problems faced by Junior College teachers in relating to their peers in senior institutions. The issue of rank and its implications for Junior College objectives has been debated on the national scene and within local faculties. At present few colleges have instituted a system of professorial ranks, but those few who have — all located in Southern California — report general satisfaction with the change. Certainly the community college teacher needs status consistent with his academic preparation and importance as a teacher; nevertheless, there is some question as to whether professorial rank is the best way to achieve this objective. Those who say it is not, are concerned that the university model may be destructive to community college objectives.

Certification is still required for Junior College teachers in California, although under certain conditions professional preparation may be deferred. There is, as yet, no general agreement as to the proper professional preparation of these teachers, and this is reflected in Table 11 which shows the certification of new teachers in 1961–62. As is typical of a majority of all Junior College teachers, a minority of these new faculty members have had professional studies which are specifically relevant to teaching in community colleges. Most administrators who employed these teachers, however, said that they preferred teachers with the Junior College credential.

TABLE 11

Credentials Earned by New Junior College Teachers Employed in 1961–62

Credential	*Number*
Vocational	82
Special Secondary	74
General Secondary	378
Junior College	230
Provisional	102
Other	52

Preliminary findings from the Los Angeles study of new teachers in 1963 suggests that the model age is between 31 and 35, and that 72% of the new teachers are male. Fifty-five percent of them are 35 years of age or under. This means that on the average they are younger than Junior College teachers in general, but the sex ratio continues the great predominance of men over women on two-year college faculties. Socio-economic backgrounds of faculty members are only vaguely known, but approximately one-third of the new teachers report their fathers' occupation to be "professional or managerial". There is much evidence, nevertheless, that Junior College teachers do not represent the same social class background as the students they teach.

The California Junior Colleges continue to attract experienced teachers as is appropriate for institutions devoted exclusively to teaching. All studies of new teachers show that the vast majority of them have taught before coming to their new college. In 1961-62 approximately 55% of the new teachers had taught previously for 5 years or more. Only 13% had no former full-time teaching, although many of these had been practice teachers in a program leading to certification. There appears to be no increase in the number of teachers who bring four-year college experience to their Junior College assignment, nor is the number of new teachers from outside California increasing. In 1961–62 each of these groups made up about 15% of those with previous teaching experience. Edinger reported similar figures in 1957–58.

TABLE 12

Distribution of New Faculty by Instructional Areas in California Junior Colleges 1957–58 to 1961–62

Area	*Per cent*
Agricultural Science	1%
Biological Sciences	7
Math., Phys. Sci., & Engr.	19
Social Sciences	16
Humanities	26
Vocations	21
Educational Services	8
No Response	1

There is little information about the distribution of total Junior College teachers among the various subject fields. However, the five-year investigation by the Coordinating Council shows the following percentage distribution among seven broad classifications.

In 1963 the distribution was similar except for the large number of nursing instructors employed. They made up the fourth largest teaching field with 41 new instructors. English, as usual, made up the largest group of teachers. To date there has been no general shortage of teachers for California's Junior Colleges, but there are several critical shortage fields. In 1961 administrators reported that recruiting was most difficult in the mathematics-science-engineering cluster, nursing, electronics, and women's physical education. Except for the last field, these shortages represent evidence of the expanding semi-professional programs at the community colleges.

The five-year study of new teachers indicates that the vast majority of these teachers (88%) are satisfied with their positions. All but 6% said that their job had turned out as they had expected. This apparent high level of satisfaction in Junior College teaching is supported by a more intensive study of similar faculties in the Florida system of Junior Colleges. Perhaps a more significant finding in California is that 83% of the sample were favorably impressed with their experiences as they related to major factors in choosing Junior College teaching in the first place. The rank order of the top four out of ten factors is: (1) Duties and Responsibilities, (2) Calibre of Associates, (3) Educational Philosophy of Department, and (4) Salary. These data would seem to support expert opinion over the years that few teachers leave the Junior College because of major dissatisfactions. The holding power of these institutions is great, as is their new potency in attracting potential teachers. Reports from graduate schools indicate increased interest in teaching at community colleges.

TEACHING CONDITIONS

With the growth and changing status of Junior Colleges have come several important changes in working conditions. In a number of aspects these conditions have become much more like those of other collegiate institutions than like those of the secondary schools which gave birth to the Junior College. The most important of these factors are discussed briefly in the light of recent data.

Although salaries in higher education still remain below those in comparable business and professional positions, the Junior Colleges have been successful in competing with other educational institutions. For example, the five-year study shows the median initial salary of Junior College teachers to be nearly identical to that for all public institutions of higher education in California. This median salary was between $6500 and $6900. The salary schedules of the several colleges show considerable regional variation, and there is much competition among institutions of comparable size and wealth to stay abreast of one another. At present the top teaching salaries are pushing $12,000 after 12-14 years of service, and almost all minimum salaries exceed the legally required minimum of $5,000. On the other hand, Junior College teachers say that salary increase is the most important factor in making their colleges more satisfying places in which to teach. Of course, it will also be a major factor in the ability of Junior Colleges to attract competent teachers in the coming decade. The American Association of Junior Colleges has projected a national need of 100,000 teachers for the two-year colleges in the decade ending in 1970. It is likely, therefore, that salaries will continue to climb in the foreseeable future.

While salaries in the past decade moved quickly to competitive levels in higher education, the hours of instructional and non-instructional duties of Junior College teachers have changed more slowly from levels found in the secondary schools to those of collegiate institutions. There is, of course, variation in the teacher loads among the three segments which is the result of differentiation of functions. When compared with Junior Colleges, the relatively low mean loads at the State Colleges (approximately 12 teaching hours) might be explained as a consequence of upper division and graduate instruction; and the even lower teaching loads (6–8 hours) at the University as a consequence of these same factors plus research responsibilities of the faculties. The complexity of the Junior College program makes such averages difficult to determine. However, two-third of these colleges are using a 15-lecture-hour base for determining loads. Only the small colleges exceed this average. From this base about half of the colleges use a 2 to 1 ratio in weighting laboratory hours, and another half use a ratio of 1½ to 1. Furthermore, a complex of factors are involved in determining the loads for hours, number of preparations, number of courses, subject matter taught, classroom size, and non-teaching responsibilities.

Brief comments should be made about two of these variables. As was the intent of the 1961 Certification Law and the general orientation of those responsible for teaching assignments in Junior Colleges, few members of Junior College faculties now teach outside their major field of competence. Eighty-six percent of new teachers report this to be so. The second variable of concern is class size. By and large the Junior Colleges, by intent and philosophy, have actually built themselves a relatively rigid pattern. Because of convictions about small classes and close student-teacher relationships, few of the community colleges have facilities for large classes. As a result average class size for lecture-type classes remain close to 30 and for laboratory classes around 25. Within these averages there are some variations due to subject fields, and a few new colleges have built lecture halls for moderately large numbers of students. It would appear that there has been inadequate experimentation in this matter of class size, particularly in view of new methods of instruction. Certainly there is little evidence to support any dogma in this matter.

THE PROBLEM OF CERTIFICATION

The celebrated "Licensing of Certificated Personnel Law of 1961" is now in operation. In spite of some excessive claims for its value to education and its disturbing attempts to define what is academic and what is not, the new law is an improvement over previous legislation. For the Junior Colleges, however, there is no significant change in the qualifications of teachers employed as a result of the law. One exception is the freedom for districts to appoint some teachers without professional preparation in education, but there has long been the use of provisional certification. It may also be true that more teachers are now teaching in their major fields at some of the smaller colleges than was true in the past.

Should certification be retained for Junior College teachers? This issue probably splits the Junior College family into two camps. Both administrators and teachers give arguments on both sides of this question. Since serious consideration was given in 1961 to the abolishment of certification of the two-year colleges it is likely that future sessions of the Legislature will be asked to decide this issue. There are a number of arguments on both sides:

For Certification

(1) The Junior College is a teaching institution, therefore it needs teachers with preparation in the art and science of teaching.

(2) The Junior Colleges have students with problems of motivation, serious academic deficiencies, and special needs. Disciplined knowledge of these characteristics and ways of dealing with them must supplement academic training for teachers.

(3) The uniqueness of the Junior College is not confined to its students. Graduate academic preparation alone does not give new teachers the understanding of commitment essential for faculty participation in curriculum development.

Against Certification

(1) As collegiate institutions the Junior Colleges cannot compete for teachers with other segments of higher education if they require additional work in professional education for employment.

(2) Many traditional education courses are reported to be of little value and are rejected

by those who have had to take them. It would be better, therefore, for the colleges to select teachers with excellent academic backgrounds and give them in-service experiences while on the job.

(3) Teaching is essentially an art and can best be learned by teaching.

Several experiments are now under way in the use of internships for the preparation of Junior College teachers. Both Berkeley and UCLA have such programs—the former now in its sixth year. There is nearly full support from administrators and general support from the teaching faculties for this type of preparation whether or not certification is retained.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Heavy responsibilities have been carried by Junior College administrators in recent years: the staggering number of students served; the selection, evaluation, and assistance to thousands of new teachers; the planning, building, financing, and managing of complex new campuses, are but a few of the areas of their responsibilities. The structuring of college administration, and the qualifications and preparation of administrative leaders have changed along with the institutions they serve. Who are these leaders, what are their qualifications, and how do they organize their management and leadership activities?

In spite of close cooperation and generally democratic procedures, there has developed a rather clear and characteristic structure for Junior College administration. Selection of the chief administrator—the superintendent or president—remains the most important task of the elected governing board. To him are delegated the responsibilities for advising trustees on policy and then carrying out such policy. Furthermore, the president represents the college in community, civic and many professional affairs. The chief administrator in turn, delegates specific responsibilities for the educational, service, and business programs to several levels of administrators. The most typical structure in contemporary Junior Colleges is for there to be a level of deans with major responsibility and authority in the three areas of the college program. Each of these deans may have one or more assistants. Finally, a very important sector of administrative activity is that of the departmental or divisional chairmen. The relationships within this hierarchy are indeed complex and are becoming more so as a result of new faculty responsibilities in the area of policy formation. Because of his essential leadership in this hierarchy, it seems important to report some contemporary data about Junior College presidents from an unpublished study done at Florida State University.

In California the presidents are recruited primarily from their own or other Junior Colleges. Of the 61 presidents studied 73.8% came from Junior College sources, 18% from the public schools, and only 8.2% from senior colleges. In this distribution California is unlike the other states because it has an extensive Junior College system from which it can draw administrative talent. These leaders also tend to be older than their peers across the country. The California average age is 51 compared to a national mean of 45 for all public Junior College presidents. In reference to highest degrees earned, the California leaders are better qualified than their peers nationally. There are 60.6% of them who have doctorates, and all but one have graduate degrees. Nationally 54.9% of the presidents have had extensive experiences in teaching and in second-level administration. The most common position held prior to appointment as president is that of dean of instruction.

In recent years approximately 50 new administrators have been appointed annually in California, and this number is expected to grow rapidly with the expansion of present colleges and the building of new ones. Since the competition for educational leadership is now on a country-wide basis, it is important to look at the national demand for Junior College administrators. Projections in the Florida study indicate that the public two-year colleges of the country will need, in the next 15 years, 943 presidents, 1086 academic deans, 803 chief student personnel administrators, and 676 business managers. These projections are considered modest, but they are disturbing to those who are aware of the shortage of leadership talent and the competition from other fields. It is likely that the demand will continue to exceed the supply and that a number of Junior Colleges may not have the quality of leadership needed. California may be more fortunate than some states because of the status of its Junior Colleges in higher education and generally competitive salaries. In 1963 salaries of presidents of independent Junior College districts in California ranged from $15,000 to $28,700; deans from $9,900 to $21,396; and business managers from $11,150 to $21,396. Other states with generally lower salaries for college personnel than found in California are now offering competitive salaries for administrative leadership. In view of the demands and shortage of talent it is likely that administrative salaries will continue to increase.

The shortage of administrative talent was anticipated some years ago, and efforts are being made to identify, prepare, and up-grade Junior College leaders. Ten university centers are now in their fifth year of serving Junior College education under grants from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. California has three such Junior College leadership programs located at The University of California at Berkeley and

Los Angeles, and Stanford University. Each of the centers have about 30 doctoral students, most of whom are considered to have the potential of becoming chief administrators in Junior Colleges. In addition, several hundred practicing administrators have already been trained by means of intensive summer workshops at the three universities. It should be noted, too, that these programs serve Junior Colleges in a number of other ways, through such activities as conferences for presidents, trustees, and other leaders in Junior College education. This new approach to the preparation of administrators is quite apart from certification requirements and programs offered at various graduate schools to meet these requirements. Of course, whether there should be certification at all for Junior College administrators is being seriously debated in California. This debate seems to have had some effect on the 1961 certification law. One consequence has been the reduction in the units of professional preparation required for either a supervision or an administrative credential. On the other hand, the new requirements for five years of previous teaching experience have prevented the appointment of young men and women with leadership talent as well as the appointment of competent administrators from other fields. The changing demands for and roles of administrators in California Junior Colleges require a reexamination of the issues of certification and preparation.

JUNIOR COLLEGE SERVICE PERSONNEL

Because the community colleges place great emphasis on guidance and service of students, the availability and qualifications of those who fill these positions are important to Junior College education. It should be pointed out that some recent legislation has complicated the efforts to give maximum service to Junior College students. Regardless of its value, the recent "50 Percent Law," which required districts to appropriate no less than 50% of their current expenditures for teaching salaries, has had negative implications for student services. Under this legislation, for example, counselors and librarians are not considered part of the teaching faculty. It is likely that certain student personnel staffs and libraries are understaffed because of this provision. Furthermore, the certification law of 1961 carries even further the special preparation needed for guidance workers in Junior Colleges. The requirements are so extensive and at times so inappropriate that Junior Colleges find themselves unable or unwilling to employ professionally trained counselors. One consequence has been an increase in the ratio of student to counselor and the use of faculty advisors in place of professional counselors. The situation has now reached the point where administrators are demanding that the pupil personnel credential no longer be required for Junior College counselors.

There is general concern about the role of student personnel services in California Junior Colleges. Their importance to the entire enterprise of the comprehensive community college has been well documented, but the effectiveness of counseling, in particular, is being questioned. A number of efforts are being made to identify the problem and seek solutions. In California the chief student personnel administrators have begun a series of professional conferences and activities which seem to be making contributions toward the improvement of counseling and other services. Furthermore, the American Association of Junior Colleges, with support from the Carnegie Foundation, has under way a major investigation of the purposes of student personnel services, their effectiveness, and recommended changes. In general, it seems important for all who are concerned with Junior College education to be sensitive to the importance of these services to community colleges as they become more closely associated with higher education.

THE PROBLEM OF STANDARDS

With the exception of three new Junior Colleges now in operation all Junior Colleges have been visited by accreditation teams and accredited under provisions of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Accreditation of Junior Colleges in California began in 1953, following a long period of negotiations and discussions about its values to Junior College education. Under agreements reached in 1952 with the Western College Association, all Junior Colleges in California at that time were automatically accredited. There was the provision, however, that in the subsequent five-year period, each college would apply for a continuation of accreditation, and would be visited and evaluated. In 1962 the Western College Association was reorganized and is now known as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In its reorganization the Association retained the commission system first established for accrediting California Junior Colleges. The Commission presently consists of five persons appointed by the California Junior College Association; two appointed by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, and one person appointed by the State Department of Education. The standards and criteria for accreditation are established by the Commission, and they are intended to encourage self-examination by the colleges and evaluation of the colleges in light of their own objectives. Each Junior College is examined each five years by a team which includes representatives from the Junior Colleges, senior colleges, and the State Department of Education. Membership of the team is spread widely among Junior College personnel on the premise that participation in the evaluation is valuable for visitors as well as those visited. Studies by Johnson and others indicate that accreditation has been of value in the improvement of Junior College instruction and operation, and it has also had an important role in the community and professional image of California Junior Colleges.

Under provisions of the California *Administrative Code* (Section 131 (e)) the Junior Colleges must have standards of scholarship for the continuance of students in college and for graduation. Minimum standards require that a student who failed to achieve a 1.5 grade point average (C—) at the end of any semester shall be placed on probation. Even prior to such regulations many Junior Colleges had established equal or higher scholarship requirements. A 1962–63 study of probation by the Bureau of Junior College Education is summarized in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Probation Standards of California Junior Colleges

Number of Colleges	*% of Total*	*Grade Point Average or Less for Probation*
2	2.7%	1.49 or less
26	36.0	1.5
4	5.5	1.6
9	12.0	1.75
25	35.0	2.0
1	1.3	2 times total units minus 10 or less
4	5.5	2 times total units minus 6 or less

Almost all colleges require students who are not high school graduates to be placed on probation at time of entry. Furthermore, students from other colleges whose transcripts show a grade point average below the entering college's grade point average for probation are placed on probation at the entering college even though they were not on probation at their previous college. Most colleges require that students on probation who fall below the college's standards, while on probation a semester, must remain out of school one semester. When they return, they are dismissed if they fall below standards set by the college.

There is grave need for intensive studies of students who withdraw from California Junior Colleges. Little is known about the factors which contribute to heavy mortality or what happens to students after dropping out. A recent Bureau study gives the following information:

> A total of 34 colleges reported data for the total number of students who withdrew because of (1) grade point average (G.P.A.) deficiency and (2) other reasons. The number of full-time students in this group of colleges was 81,571. The number of students withdrawing because of G.P.A. deficiency was 11,130 (14%) and for other reasons 26,059 (32%).

The complexity of the problem of determining appropriate standards and some of the myths associated with this task have been discussed earlier. The Junior Colleges have had particular problems in setting standards because of diverse programs which serve students of different abilities and interests. At their best the Junior Colleges have struggled to maintain the open door of opportunity while at the same time to preserve the standards of specific programs and courses — and of its certificates and degrees. Some colleges have faltered, perhaps, in this difficult job by confusing Junior College standards with those of the senior institutions. It is likely, however, that the general concern for standards and the temperate use of probation and dismissal systems will, in the long run, give substance to the open door concept. In brief, this concept means the right of young and mature adults to have access to post-high school education which is appropriate to their wide range of goals but which has standards requiring commensurate abilities and effort. The success or failure of Junior College leaders in solving this equation will determine who will be educated in California beyond the secondary schools.

The foregoing has surveyed in broad terms the status of California Junior Colleges today. The survey discloses the many strengths of the California program and the highly successful record made to date. However, also disclosed by this survey are a number of problems and issues of concern to those most interested in the future of California higher education and the role played by the Junior Colleges. The following sections examine more closely certain of the subjects noted in this section: Junior College district organizational relationships, the problem of governance, and, in Section III, the finance of Junior College programs.

SECTION II

SEPARATION OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGES FROM THE SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGES[1]

Separation of the Junior Colleges from secondary school systems involves two distinct but related issues: (1) the governance of the local Junior College district, and (2) the development of higher education in Junior Colleges. As separation occurs, a third issue, the future governance of Junior Colleges by the State of California becomes increasingly prominent. None of these issues are new, but all have come to the fore with the evolving maturity of the California Junior Colleges.

SEPARATION FROM SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A movement as dynamic, as indigenous, as strong, and as firmly rooted as the Junior College is not likely to be drastically affected, except over a period of time, by organizational changes which in many respects have been in the making for years. The pattern of growth or development is a familiar one: post-high school courses added to the high school curriculum, often in the same building and with the same instructors; then separation into a Junior College department or college; next, separation from the high school district into a separate Junior College district, sometimes completely independent of the high school or unified district, at other times associated by a common board and common central administration. Beginning in 1938 the term "junior" was dropped from the names of the institutions until today less than seven still retain it.

GOVERNANCE OF LOCAL DISTRICTS

Organizationally, Junior Colleges can be grouped into four categories according to the nature of governing districts: high school, unified, Junior College sharing common board and central administration with the unified, and Junior College with separate board. The majority of districts are now separated from the secondary schools. All new districts must, by law, be organized as independent Junior College districts.

If Porterville, as is likely, joins Bakersfield, Lassen will then be the only Junior College remaining operated by a high school district. The twelve Junior College districts now governed by a common board with the unified districts are logical candidates for separation. Separating the seven unified districts may arouse more resistance among administrators. Even among the seven, the majority seem ready for the separation and would offer little opposition from either administrators or instructors. Not more than three would seriously resist the separation. The trend at the local level is definitely toward separation of the Junior College districts from the high school and unified districts. As was stated in a "Draft of Position Statement on Junior College Role" by a committee of the California Junior College Association, the Junior College "has reached a point where it is clearly higher education, with only vestigial remains of its secondary legacy."

Since by law Junior Colleges are institutions of higher education and since new Junior College districts must be organized under separate boards, no useful purpose will be served to enumerate all the causes that have led to the separation at the local level. However, it must be pointed out that a small minority of administrators are still opposed to separation. One of the few statements against separation was made in 1960 by Dr. George E. Dotson, then Assistant Superintendent (Secondary) of the Long Beach Unified District and President of the Long Beach City College. Among the advantages he listed for unified school districts were better articulation with the high schools and superior services derived from use of the greater resources of a unified district, such as teacher recruitment, in-service training of staff, curriculum development, health service, purchasing, school building and site planning, and others. Similar sentiments have been expressed by administrators of the San Francisco and San Diego Junior Colleges. One of the administrators volunteered the information that a principal reason faculty members in his district favor separation is to obtain a separate salary schedule. The administrators also agreed that Junior College instructors should be paid higher salaries than elementary or secondary instructors.

Any change, such as formal separation on a statewide basis, will cause concern because of the uncertainty of its effects on the present system. Dissatisfaction with certain aspects or relationships of the present system of locally-controlled Junior Colleges with an overlay of State control does not necessarily mean that all critics are anxious to advocate the creation of a State board for Junior College education or similar agency.

---

[1] This material is taken principally from papers prepared by Dr. John Lombardi and Dr. Leland Medsker.

Representatives of faculty organizations are working for separation at the local level. For support they point to a Coordinating Council for Higher Education study which reported that "the faculty of the Junior Colleges recommend that separate Junior College districts would make the Junior Colleges more attractive to present faculty members."[2] Legislation has been suggested to accomplish separation of Junior Colleges from the high school and unified districts and legislators are being asked to support them. The California Junior College Faculty Association and the Junior College members of the American Federation of Teachers are espousing the separation.

Separation from the secondary school at the local level is proceeding smoothly because no major or fundamental changes are required in patterns of district organization, in the principles of financial support, or in the practices. Often all that is involved in the changeover is the election of a new board, selection of some new personnel, and the equitable allocation of assets and liabilities. Predictions are hazardous but it is safe to guess that within the next five years only a handful of districts will remain attached to unified districts and none to a high school. This will be accomplished voluntarily on the local level in some districts and perhaps by legislative mandate in others, particularly in the Junior College districts which share common boards and central administrations with the unified.

Junior College administrators are, most of the time, consciously bringing about separation from the secondary school by emphasis on their higher education status, by their requests to the Legislature for treatment different from that accorded the secondary school, by their search for a spokesman comparable to those of the other segments of higher education, and by their adoption of higher education practices in nearly every phase of their activities. Rarely, except in finances, do they favor a secondary education over a higher education practice.

Reluctance to separate from the secondary school seems to be based more on organizational and financial considerations than on educational reasons. If the trend toward higher education status is far advanced, if it is taking place in Junior Colleges under all forms of district organization, and if Junior College educators are not trying to halt or reverse the trend, then the fear that separation from the secondary school will drastically change the character of the Junior College has no basis. Dangers, of course, are present under any form of organization; however, there is no reason to believe that under a State system, Junior College educators will act differently than at present, or, as one Junior College administrator stated it, "so unprofessionally as to destroy the Junior College as an institution."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN JUNIOR COLLEGES

The effect of separation of the Junior College from the secondary school will, in most instances, be supportive of the direction toward higher education. This trend is fully documented in the organizational development of the districts and in the adoption of higher education practices in the colleges. The Donahoe Higher Education Act gave the Junior Colleges legal status as institutions of higher education. The upward mobility which has been characteristic of American education is not likely to be absent in the Junior College. Though the community, the faculty, the administration may not always be in accord on particular issues, on this they are in agreement: all want higher education status for the Junior College.

Separation at the local level has been accompanied by the shedding of secondary practices and the adoption of higher education practices. Although this process has not always been met with universal approval, it has been inexorable. Not only does it include dropping "junior" from the institutional names, changing principals and vice-principals into presidents and deans, and teachers into instructors and professors, but also class schedules, grading practices, record keeping, and a myriad of other activities adopted from the four-year colleges. The widespread establishment of academic senates is the most recent example of the trend toward higher education status. Before the Legislature and the State Board of Education made them mandatory if faculties desired them, academic senates were being formed in Junior Colleges. The legislation and the action of the State Board is an illustration of the kind of acceleration that may happen if separation at the State level were effected. Academic senates in one form or another would have come without State action but at a slower pace. The trend shows no sign of abating. By their actions, by their practices, by their attitudes, the personnel in the Junior Colleges reveal distinctly that they are part of higher education. They would refute any intimation that they are secondary in any respects, except in method of State support.

PROBLEMS EVOLVING FROM SEPARATING JUNIOR COLLEGES FROM SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Separating Junior Colleges from secondary school systems leads to increasing concern about what should occur in four areas: (1) credentials, (2) recruitment of faculty, (3) vocational education, and (4) the "open door policy." The effect of separation from the secondary school on credentials and recruitment may be widely accepted for the anticipated benefits of these changes. No such acceptance will be given for the possible changes in the open door policy and in the development of vocational programs. In these areas administrators have much to do to convince the faculty to maintain the traditional interpretations. Some rationale or internal organization must be developed to reconcile higher education status with acceptance of students with low-aptitude remedial needs, and vocational education programs not of a technical or semi-professional level.

---

[2] *A Report on the Study of Faculty Opinion Toward Salary, Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions*, #1007 (Sacramento and San Francisco, August 1963), p. 36.

Credentials. Many administrators are dissatisfied with the credential system. The recent changes in State regulations while strengthening some aspects of certification have, on the other hand, introduced difficulties. In the first place a good deal of clerical and administrative time must be expended in the preparation and processing of reports whenever individuals are assigned to teach in their minor instead of their major fields. Second, colleges with small enrollments are finding staffing extremely difficult because of the restrictions placed on the holders of credentials. Third, assignment of instructors to fields closely related to their majors and minors is extremely difficult to accomplish. Fourth, the Superintendent of Public Instruction indicated at the fall 1964 meeting of the California Junior College Association that the volume of applications for credentials is so great that the State Department of Education is having extreme difficulty processing them. Aside from these specific objections, many administrators favor the elimination of any credential system because it is a hindrance in competing for instructors with colleges which do not require credentials and in attracting vocational instructors from business and industry.

The present credential regulations were intended to rectify an alleged abuse which permitted instructors to teach subjects not their graduate or undergraduate majors. How wide-spread this abuse was among Junior Colleges was not adequately explored or investigated. A study, conducted by Michigan State University in cooperation with the American Association of Junior Colleges revealed that 66.3% or 1,847 of the respondents replied that "Subject taught agrees with major (Master's or Doctor's degree) and that another 22.6% or 630 replied that "Subject taught agrees with undergraduate (Bachelor's degree)." This compares with 69% senior college faculty replying in another study "Teaching only in major field" and 17% "Teaching major and at least one other field." In the Junior College study 9% replied that "Subject taught does not agree with graduate or undergraduate major", while in the other study 12% responded "not teaching in major". A comparison of these two studies indicates that the record of Junior Colleges was satisfactory.[3]

Notwithstanding these considerations consensus among administrators does not exist on this issue. An informal poll of approximately sixty administrators attending a meeting of the Committee on Finance and Legislation of the California Junior College Association resulted in a 40% vote against seeking legislation to eliminate credentials.[3a]

Some administrators have expressed concern that the elimination of credentials would lead to the spoils system, nepotism, or other abuses in the employment of instructors. Board members and administrators in small districts are considered vulnerable to this pressure, especially where local pride is so strong it forces the employment of local applicants regardless of their qualifications; although abuses of this and other kinds have not been unknown in large districts as well. A minor irritant which would disappear with the elimination of the credential relates to administrators. Elimination would make possible a more realistic approach to the selection of administrators in general and give vocational instructors administrative opportunities they do not now have because administrative credentials are based upon academic teaching credentials. For example, vocational instructors cannot qualify for a pupil personnel credential without an academic master's degree. Another possible benefit, recruitment from outside the state would be facilitated.

Faculty organizations now are suspicious of efforts to eliminate the credential. They favor the credential system because it is a partial form of job protection and it prevents administrators from assigning them to teach subjects not in their major fields. The California Junior College Faculty Association opposed an attempt to modify the present credential law. However, if a State system were adopted there would be less opposition to changes or elimination of the present regulations.

The elimination of the credential is not likely to lead to abuses. The past record indicates that assignments have been made in accordance with the instructors' majors. This has been true in the states without, as well as those with credentials systems. Moreover, the accreditation process will act as a safeguard since this is one area a visiting team looks into on its quinquennial visits. Another safeguard against indiscriminate assignments will be the newly-formed academic senates in the institutions.

If other safeguards are needed, educators suggest that minimum standards for employment, including a master's degree for the academic and an associate's degree for the vocational, be established; that large districts operating several colleges might introduce a form of civil service examination system, and that internships now conducted on an experimental basis be expanded cooperatively between the Junior Colleges and universities. It is reasonable to predict that if the separation of the Junior Colleges from the secondary schools were to take effect at the State level, the present credential system would be eliminated. It would be illogical to impose upon one member of a tripartite system of higher education a requirement not imposed upon the others.

---

[3] Hugo E. Siehr, John X. Jamrich, and Karl T. Hereford, *Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges*, 1963 and Harlan R. McCall, John X. Jamrich, Karl T. Herford and Burton D. Friedman, *Problems of New Faculty Members in College and Universities*, 1961. Both studies were published by Michigan State University. In the Community Colleges study 61 California colleges participated.

[3a] CJCA, *Minutes*, September 25, 1964.

Recruitment. Not all administrators agree that separation at either the local or State level is more conducive to recruitment than association of Junior Colleges with unified districts. A small minority contends that separation at the local level results in a serious set-back in teacher recruitment from the district high schools because instructors lose benefits in salary, accumulated sick leave, tenure status and other perquisites if they move to a Junior College in an independent district. The supply of experienced and outstanding instructors from the high school is likewise sharply curtailed, they claim, as a result of separation.

The great majority of administrators and faculty believe that recruitment of instructors would be improved with the separation from the secondary system. Besides attracting more instructors from a wider geographical source, separation would enable the Junior Colleges to compete on a more favorable basis with four-year colleges. University graduates who have a stronger interest in teaching than in research would find Junior Colleges on a State system more appealing than at present.

A reverse process might also develop. Mobility from Junior Colleges to four-year campuses might be facilitated. While this might seem a disadvantage, actually it might increase the attractiveness of the Junior College to younger applicants. Mobility in both directions would have beneficial results for both systems.

Administrators also believe that Junior Colleges in independent districts have a wider geographical source of candidates than those attached to high school or unified districts because they are not bound by local policies to select or give preference to high school teachers who, failing to get appointments in the Junior College, tend to be disgruntled and antagonistic toward the Junior College.

If separation at the State level were in effect it would be possible to establish State policies which would enable instructors to move within the system without the loss of benefits mentioned by the proponents of the unified district organization. This would not increase the number of instructors but the existence of this possibility might be an added attraction to prospective instructors.

Retention of faculty would also improve. Present faculty members believe that association with a unified district attaches the stigma of a "glorified high school" to the institution and that one of the factors that "leads colleagues away to other institutions . . . [is] the desire to leave a Junior College organized with other levels of public schools."[4] Faculty members believe that re-organizing, Junior Colleges that are in the structure of unified school districts would make them "more attractive to present faculty members."[5]

If separation were coupled with the elimination of the credential, recruitment from non-educational sources would be facilitated. "Second careers in education" would appear more attractive to men and women in business, industry, and government, including the military.

Vocational Education. Under the present arrangements not much difference exists in the educational programs of Junior Colleges operating under the high school, unified, or Junior College district pattern. A wide variety of vocational programs may be found in most colleges regardless of district organization. More important than district organization in determining the pattern and breadth of vocational programs is location, student enrollment, financial resources, and attitudes of personnel. Sometimes the first three may be operating at the same time as is true with some Junior Colleges located in sparsely settled areas, with low enrollments and limited financial resources. Sometimes, financial resources are adequate, as at Coalinga and Taft, but low student enrollments make it difficult to support a wide variety of programs. Attitudes of personnel have great influence on the development of vocational programs, as will be pointed out later.

Probably the most restrictive condition affecting vocational education is size of the Junior College. Among the problems discussed at a "Conference of Small Junior Colleges" sponsored by the Bureau of Junior College Education on February 29, 1964, was the "limited (expensive) offerings due to small enrollments (particularly in vocational . . . courses)." The conferees recognized the need to offer the newer technical-vocational programs but they could not do so because "most of them are too expensive." The point in all of this is the commitment of these administrators to vocational education. So strong is this commitment that they are trying to surmount some of their difficulties by renting machines for business education classes and by participating in area planning so that students may take specialized vocational courses at one college and basic studies at the "home" Junior College.[6]

There is no question concerning the commitment of governing boards, administrators, and faculty to the role of Junior Colleges in this area. Despite disagreement concerning the kinds of vocational programs which are suitable for Junior Colleges, the scope of vocational education includes programs of the trade and apprentice type such as bricklaying, carpentry, toolmaking, auto body repair, printing, and a host of others as well as technical and semi-professional.

---

[4] CCHE, *Faculty Opinion Toward Salary . . .*, No. 1007, p. 39.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[6] Bureau of J.C. Educ., "Report of Conference . . .", Release No. 14, May 5, 1964.

A strong incentive for continuing development of vocational education has been, and will continue to be, the various forms of federal aid for instruction, facilities, and subsidies to students. Junior Colleges are cooperating wholeheartedly in the Manpower Development and Training Program and are eager to participate in the various federal assistance acts recently passed and funded. This will remove one of the impediments to vocational education—high cost—and may help persuade students through subsidies to give serious consideration to vocational rather than transfer programs.

The aforementioned general statements must be modified by another perspective. Although, as one expert in vocational education remarked, "there is nothing magical in the organizational status that predetermines the extent and character of vocational educational offerings", nevertheless, individuals attach connotations to names and symbols which have great influence in shaping their ideas in this area as in others. Some (the number is difficult to determine) Junior College board members, administrators, and faculty want to exclude from the curriculum all but a few of the more respectable, high-level vocational programs. In general they do not want any programs that do not carry bona fide college credits. Henry J. Tyler, Executive Secretary of the California Junior College Association wrote that the law making the Junior College part of higher education has "been distorted by some to imply that . . . they should give up all [programs] except the transfer programs." He also quoted President Wendell Black of Harbor College who warned his faculty against the reasoning that because "'now we are higher education . . . we must get rid of programs that are not typically college level.'"[7] Separating the Junior Colleges from the secondary schools would give encouragement to those who advocate "upgrading" the vocational programs and leaving the rest to adult, trade or area vocational schools.

Educators in the other post-high school institutions will welcome the opportunity to take over these programs. For some time adult education administrators have been engaged in a jurisdictional conflict with college administrators over alleged usurpation of certain vocational and other functions. Federal aid is giving them opportunities to increase their activities in vocational education and since they are not now concerned with higher education status they are offering vocational programs considered by some educators inappropriate for an institution of higher education. A possibility exists that in Berkeley, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other urban centers, area vocational schools may be established independently of the Junior College. This development may influence the kind of vocational programs Junior Colleges in these areas will offer.

With separation at the State level this process might be accelerated. If adult or area vocational schools should organize extensive programs of vocational education, pressure would soon develop to restrict all Junior Colleges to the "higher" semi-professional and technical programs. Plausible arguments could be developed to justify this in the interests of economy and conservation of resources. In fact, such pressure exists at present but it is diffused because each local board determines the level of vocational program that is suitable for its Junior College.

Rationally, there is merit in the point of view that the Junior College should restrict itself to a certain segment of vocational education, just as there is agreement that certain educational programs are most suitable for high schools, others for Junior Colleges, others for adult schools, and so on. No one would argue that Junior Colleges should offer courses in professional education or in medicine.

Yet, sometimes it seems as if Junior College educators make claims that all vocational fields below the professional should be offered in the Junior Colleges. This is patently impossible. Some selection must be made. It should be made on some basis similar to that used for deciding which programs are the province of the State Colleges and which of the University. Some of the criteria might include custom, tradition, availability of resources, degree of sophistication or difficulty, maturity required in students, job requirements, and others. Overlapping will exist here as it does in the transfer and general education programs, but the wide disparity might disappear.

Separation from the secondary school may lead to evaluation of Junior College vocational programs with the objective of determining which programs should be included and which excluded. Just as the Coordinating Council has questioned the inclusion of certain education courses in the Junior College curriculum, so may it or the State agency for Junior Colleges some day raise questions concerning a particular vocational course or curriculum. More specific criteria for vocational courses could very likely result from these questions. This need not produce the ill effects feared by those who are trying to preserve the vocational education function of the Junior Colleges. It could strengthen the vocational programs.

In conclusion, if the Junior Colleges follow the upward mobility which marked other institutions of higher education, the separation from the secondary school may hasten the process of upgrading the vocational offerings in Junior Colleges. This does not mean their elimination; it may mean concentration in certain vocational fields selected on the basis of criteria established by a State agency.

---

[7] Tyler, "The Junior College Role in California Higher Education," March 23, 1963, mimeo.

The Open Door Policy. Historically, the doors of California Junior Colleges have been open to all who could present evidence that they could profit from attendance. High school graduation or reaching maturity in other ways acceptable to a Junior College are the traditional requirements for admission. The effect of the separation of Junior Colleges from the secondary school may inpinge with great force upon the open door policy. The open door is under serious attack by many members of the instructional staff in the Junior Colleges. Concern is deep-seated and has its basis in the apparently deteriorating scholastic qualifications of students.

Whenever a group of faculty members are polled on their sentiments, many express their feelings in clear and unequivocal language. One instructor wrote: "If a student with glaring scholastic weaknesses wishes to enroll, state forcefully in writing and give statistical evidence that for him to enroll is to court failure. Send him names of schools and classes in his area where his lack of basic skill can be remedied." A circular of the American Federation of Teachers in Los Angeles posed three questions which are indicative of widespread concern among many in the Junior Colleges. These questions are significant enough to warrant quoting them in full:

> *Admission policies:* Are the best interests of society and of the individual served by admitting nearly all applicants, as at present, and letting them discover the hard way that they are incapable of doing college work? Or could a great waste of student time and tax money be prevented by refusing admission to those whose test scores indicate that they cannot do any of the work offered at present, including remedial work? If the latter alternative is accepted, can this result be accomplished by a change in the state law?[8]

Many instructors, and to a lesser extent, administrators, are having difficulty justifying the inclusion of low-level remedial courses in an institution of higher education.

The increasing interest of the Coordinating Council, Legislature, and the State Board of Education in tighter standards for probation and dismissal affect the open door policy. Some faculty members and administrators interpret the emphasis on criteria for graded classes and scholarship standards as suggestions for not adhering too closely to the open door policy. As a result of this pressure, little effort is made by some instructors and administrators to determine what can be done for the low-ability student. Instead, the attitude is widely prevalent that nothing can or should be done; if these students cannot do "college" work they should be disqualified at the earliest opportunity. The open door has been facetiously dubbed the "revolving" door or cynically, the "open door to the lobby."

Others who are sympathetic to the open door raise questions concerning the degree of adherence to the policy by administrators and faculty. At a conference of student personnel officers in January 1964, at least three of the speakers charged that by omission or commission, or both, the open door is a myth. "For far too many of the low-ability students the open door leads to a blind alley."[9]

If these conditions exist now, they may become more so if a separation from the secondary school takes place, especially when the trend already is directed "toward making the standards governing probation and disqualification more rigorous and toward insuring somewhat comprehensive standards uniform throughout the junior college system."[10] If more rigorous standards are instituted, the goal of universal educational opportunity for at least two years of college education open to any high school graduate may receive a serious set-back in California. It is improbable that there will be a more faithful adherence to the open door policy if, at the same time that more rigorous standards are being advocated, the Junior Colleges become part of a coordinated system of higher education with a State board or similar agency.

Separation from the secondary school may — probably will — be accompanied by more and larger fees. Non-resident tuition and optional fees for health and parking are the beginning of a process that will become a part of Junior College practices. The Coordinating Council is likely to continue raising questions concerning this as the Junior Colleges become more closely affiliated with higher education. The California Junior College Association has gone on record against compulsory fees but it has advocated the passage of legislation permitting local boards to authorize student body fees. Once fees are authorized for one activity the tendency will be for others to be authorized.

The possibility exists that the open door will be retained in fact as in theory; but under conditions in which students considered incapable of doing college work would be placed in an extension division, in a division of improvement, or in a separate building. A suggestion has been made that in multi-college districts one of the campuses be designed for these students. Some such plans are reported to be in effect at Delta College, Michigan, where a Dean of Improvement is responsible for remedial work and in Pensacola College, Florida, where the non-technical vocational courses are housed in a building across the street from the regular campus. A concomitant of this suggestion is to offer low-aptitude students and those in short-term trade programs only ungraded, non-credit courses.

---

[8] "A.F.T'er Thoughts," Bulletin of the *American Federation of Teachers,* Los Angeles, December 1963.

[9] A. Robert De Hart, ed. *Implementing the Open Door.* Proceedings of a Conference for Chief Student Personnel Administrators, January 9–11, 1964. Foothill College. See, especially, speeches by Ernest Berg, Oakland City College, George Ebey, College of San Mateo and Dale Tillery, University of California, Berkeley.

[10] Memo to Junior College Presidents and others from Algee Brill, Chairman, Special Committee on Attendance and Enrollment Studies, October 2, 1964.

GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES AT THE STATE LEVEL

OTHER STATES

Given the premise that many states will continue to operate their two-year institutions under some type of local control, there arises an important question concerning the best means of state coordination of Junior Colleges. This is a complex question which inquires into the degree of responsibility the state should assume and also into the most appropriate type of state agency for coordination and service. The most dominant pattern found in more than 20 states is for the state agency that is responsible for the public school system to be responsible, also at the state level, for local junior and community colleges. This is the situation in many of the mid-western states and in Washington, Texas, and North Carolina. A few states with local Junior Colleges, including Arizona and Wyoming, have separate state boards for the creation of Junior Colleges. In a few other states the responsibility is either solely in the hands of or shared with a state board for higher education. Examples of this situation are found in Iowa, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, and Rhode Island. In other states the situation is difficult to define because of the fact that the state agency involved is either a quasi-legal body or is one which plays an intermediate role. This is particularly true in Florida, New York, and Michigan.

In several states public Junior Colleges are completely under the control of the state. Here there are two possibilities: (1) two-year colleges are directly under some overall state agency with no local connections other than some type of advisory board, and (2) two-year colleges are part of a university system and thus operate as extension centers. Examples of the first category exist in Oklahoma, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Minnesota. Martorana found that only about 5% of the public two-year colleges fall in this category. However, one hears increasing discussion about this pattern as a possibility, particularly in states where tax monies are so limited as to discourage the creation of local Junior College districts. Only last year Minnesota enacted legislation providing for this type of organization for its community colleges. One of the arguments used in advancing the legislation was that in the twin-cities area as well as in other regions of the state, where Junior Colleges were so badly needed, the local communities were unable to levy additional taxes and thus Junior Colleges were likely not to be established, if left to local initiative. Since the Minnesota legislation was passed, a new state agency for community colleges has been set up and plans are moving ahead for the establishment of new two-year institutions. The former local junior colleges have been brought into the State plan.

Examples of the university extension center are found in Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky. Martorana found that about one-fourth of the public Junior Colleges fall into this category.

CALIFORNIA

In the last analysis, however, California must approach its problems from the point of view of its own philosophical orientation, the general state pattern of education of which it is a part, and the resources at its command. The experience of other states can be suggestive, but it should not dictate the directions for California. What, then, are the questions about governance that are particularly significant for California? It is assumed that California Junior Colleges will remain for an indefinite period under some type of local board. The type of board is pretty much an academic question, since 54 of the 64 districts are now independent ones and 41 of these have separate governing boards. Given this assumption, *the major question becomes that of the most appropriate agency for carrying the State's responsibility for Junior Colleges, together with the duties and services which should be the province of the staff of such an agency.* As expressed previously, the three possibilities are the State Board of Education, in conjunction with the State Department of Education; a separate State board for Junior Colleges; or a quasi-legal or special advisory agency to the State Board of Education.

At the recent Fresno meeting, President Robert Swenson of the California Junior Colleges Association raised certain questions about state patterns. They were divided into three categories, as follows:

(1.) Organization and control. What type of state board might be created? How would it affect the authority of existing local boards? Would a separate administrative agency be created? Would increasing state regulation necessarily follow? Would more control mean more standardization — personnel practices, salaries, etc.? How would these changes affect the character of the community college?

(2.) Finance. Would a change in structure alter the present state financing plan? Might this threaten the constitutional guarantees providing current support? If so, would Junior Colleges find themselves competing with other institutions of higher education? What plan is most apt to preserve the principle of tuition-free education?

(3.) Curriculum and instruction. Would more centralized control and planning contribute to a) better articulation with senior institutions, b) coordinated planning for vocational-technical programs, c) more uniform standards, or how would broader based planning affect responsiveness to community needs? Would stronger centralized authority tend to stereotype the curricular patterns and discourage local experimentation?

The questions tend to hinge on what would happen if a separate State board were to be created. Thus, they cannot be answered categorically since the powers and responsibilities of such a board would have to be spelled out by the Legislature. Presumably, the representatives of the Junior Colleges would exert some leadership in shaping any proposed legislation for a separate board.

But before assuming the need for a separate board, some guidelines or basic principles may be helpful in evaluating various alternatives. Dr. Leland Medsker has developed certain assumptions and criteria which are presented here.

Assumption 1. Basic to a discussion of control is a consideration of *values*. Educational institutions, like other organizations, are rationally structured and goal-directed. Perhaps the most important set of values is what Selznick calls "the evolving character of the organization as a whole."[11] This implies the necessity for desirable and realistic goals and the question thus becomes one of how organizations are to be governed so as to co-ordinate their human and material resources in the realization of these goals and in the fulfillment of the institution's character. Types of colleges as well as individual institutions must have goals which they constantly seek to achieve in the evolvement of institutional character.

A possible criterion: The control pattern must be such as to recognize an institution as an *entity* with a *character* which it must achieve through the pursuit of goals. In other words, each institution is a personality which like a human being has—or should have—hopes and ambitions to be fulfilled and which if not fulfilled will wither and leave the institution sterile. This would seem particularly applicable to an agency such as the community college with its many avowed purposes and objectives. Whatever the control, the entity and dignity of the institution must be preserved.

Assumption 2. Despite the close relationship between financial support and control there are philosophical and pragmatic reasons why the two elements should be considered separately as well as jointly in the planning of an educational institution. Admittedly, the importance of adequate financial support and also of financial control . . . cannot be underestimated nor can the examples of how financial control affects the college program be minimized. There would appear to be a danger, however, in assuming that the control pattern has to parallel the financial pattern. Mort and Reusser have touched on this point in their book on *Public School Finance*. They expand the idea that although public education has been generally conceded to be a function of the state, the development of local school systems has resulted in education being neither a total state nor a total local responsibility. The authors then say that this dualism makes unrealistic the theory that he who pays the piper plays the tune. They go on to state, "The support system must be built up on terms of the problems of taxation, both the economic and the practical, and the control system should be built up in terms of what in the long run promises the best results in the educational enterprise and in the satisfaction of the citizens."[12]

A criterion: The legal entity which really directs the community college need not necessarily procure all or even most of its tax money from within itself. The planning of community colleges should be done within the framework of all higher education and if major state funds are used in the support of such colleges, the stewardship of these funds, with proper reporting procedures, can be vested in control bodies which may be more effective than the state as a control agency. Note that this principle does not say that support and control *have* to be vested in separate bodies—they simply *may* be.

Assumption 3. There is a relationship between the effectiveness of control and the closeness of the controlling agency to be controlled. In their work *Public Administration*, the Dimocks make a distinction between two concepts of control—executive or administrative control and democratic control. They state that the democratic principle requires that the exercise of control over policy or action be placed by law as close to the people as can be done feasibly, all other principles taken into account.[13]

A criterion: The controlling body of a community college should be as close as possible to the people served by the college. This would argue for local control over a state system. It would also suggest that, when feasible, the majority of the people served by a college should have the right to participate in the selection of the governing board. This in turn would imply that the boundaries of the college entity should correspond closely to the area from which the college draws most of its students.

---

[11] Philip Selznick, *Leadership in Administration* (New York: Row-Peterson Co., 1957), p. 38.

[12] P. Mort and W. C. Reusser, *Public School Finance* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), p. 46.

[13] M. E. Dimock and G. O. Dimock, *Public Administration* (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1953), p. 86.

Assumption 4. A governing board of any educational institution bears a heavy and time-consuming responsibility. This is particularly true in the case of the community college with its diversity of purposes and programs. The following statement appears in a document prepared by the Middle States Association on suggestions for faculties, trustees, and others interested in improving or establishing two-year institutions. "Good trustees undertake their office with a sense of responsibility and a readiness to take enough time to study and understand educational problems and practices and to become acquainted with their own institution in more than a superficial way. Lack of time, failure to take enough time for the work, is often the reason when a trustee proves inadequate."[14] Presumably, this statement was aimed at individual trustees but it applies as well to governing boards as a whole.

A criterion: Governing agencies of community colleges must not have so many additional responsibilities that the time and energy available for the direction of the community college is beyond the realm of probability.

Assumption 5. Those in whom is vested the control of a community college must believe in this type of institution. Referring again to the Middle States document, "Good trustees believe in the institutions they control. They are its disinterested and impartial governors and at the same time its loyal interpreters and aggressive supporters." Frequently the boards which govern community colleges are those which have responsibility for other types of educational institutions. This, of course, does not necessarily preclude their belief and interest in the community college but it at least raises the question of whether there may exist a lack of understanding, sympathy, or even a partial conflict of interest. Sometimes it seems very logical for one board to have jurisdiction over two or more agencies, but this may deprive an institution of what Selznick calls "institutional integrity." He has said: "The fallacy of combining agencies on the basis of logical association of functions is a characteristic result of the failure to take account of institutional integrity."[15] At least this is a warning.

A criterion: The controlling agency of a community college should be one which can have no conflict of interests between the community college and any other institution for which it is responsible. Its dedication to the unique characteristics of the community college must be unquestioned.

Assumption 6. Since education is to some extent a state responsibility, there must be close coordination of community colleges with all other segments of education. These colleges cannot operate in a vacuum. Such coordination does not, however, necessarily take the form of detailed control. For example, in those states where community colleges are under the jurisdiction of local boards, the coordination at the state level must insure the proper functioning of these institutions in view of the state's educational needs and resources, but there must be a fine line between coordination and control. Mort and Reusser had a word on this too when they said: "Most legislative action should be structured in nature. It should be concerned with setting up a framework within which the local administrative bodies can operate effectively."[16] When to draw the fine line or how to set up the framework for coordination and yet preserve local autonomy, is a matter in need of further discussion.

A criterion: Any state plan for community colleges should be just that—a state plan. Each institution should have its own individuality and, if under a local board, should be autonomous, subject to minimum standards imposed and enforced by the State. An appropriate state agency should coordinate community colleges with high schools and other colleges. Even state-controlled community colleges and extension centers are not exempt from the need for coordination with other segments of education. The state agency should set policy and assist in operating within the framework of such policy, with the expectation that their effectiveness will be evaluated.

Four generalized applications to the California situation of the above may be stated as follows:

1. There should, and undoubtedly will, be increasing coordination and planning at the State level for Junior Colleges in California.
   This trend is apparent throughout the country, not only in so far as Junior Colleges are concerned but for all public higher education. Only recently, Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education and an advocate of institutional autonomy, wrote:

   > Local demands must be balanced against wider needs, and short-range pressures against long-range objectives . . . . Too much insistence on outmoded forms of sovereignty can lead only to chaos . . . . We have no option, therefore, but to adapt ourselves and our organizations to changing circumstances.[17]

   The question is, of course, how much coordination and how. But with the soon-to-be 100 Junior Colleges (more or less); with increasing State aid; and with the necessity that the total Junior College program be closely meshed with the State's total needs, the pressure for State concern about the Junior College program will increase. If the Junior Colleges do not take the initiative on the matter of how best to bring this about, someone else will.

---

[14] *Junior Colleges and Community Colleges,* Document No. 4, 60, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, December, 1958.

[15] *Op. cit.,* p. 58.

[16] *Op. cit.,* p. 46.

[17] Logan Wilson, "Form and Function in American Higher Education," *Educational Record,* Summer 1964, pp. 301, 307.

2. Just as there can be a balance between State aid and local control, so should it be possible to have local support with some State control.
3. Whatever the type and nature of the State agency, it should not destroy the integrity and personality of the local institution.
4. The State agency must have sufficient interest in and time to devote to Junior College matters so that the welfare of these institutions is paramount. The services which the staff of such an agency renders to individual institutions and for the system are as important as the coordination function.

There appears to be no absolute criteria for determining the most logical medium for governance of California Junior Colleges at the State level. Practices in other states can be reported, but there needs to be an examination of just how effective the pattern in each state is and what problems it poses. The Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley has received a foundation grant which will make such an analysis possible. Even then, however, the problem in each state has to evolve in terms of what plan seems most logical under the circumstances.

On July 10, 1964, the President of the California Junior College Association, Dr. Robert E. Swenson, requested the Senate Subcommittee of Higher Education to await the results of studies now underway by various agencies "before preparing any legislation which would significantly change the governing of Junior Colleges at the State level."

Notwithstanding this plea for delay, President Swenson and Dr. John N. Given, Legislative Advocate of the California Junior College Association, felt that "some degree of coherence and coordination is necessary, especially as regards junior college relations with the University of California, the California State Colleges, and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education." These ". . . need attention in order that lines of communication and areas of responsibility may be more clearly defined." In neither Dr. Given's nor President Swenson's testimony was mention made of the problems connected with communication and coordination among the Junior Colleges.[18]

President Swenson suggested as an alternate to the State board the establishment of a "Division of Junior College Education whose chief would have cabinet rank." In this Division "all Department staff members whose duties relate to junior colleges would be brought together." If effected, this proposal would accomplish at the Department of Education level, complete separation from the secondary school by bringing together the eighteen or more segments of the Department related to Junior Colleges in one way or another.

The proposal leaves unanswered the outcome of widespread faculty and administrator advocacy of separation of Junior Colleges still attached to high school and unified districts either by organizational pattern or by common boards and central administrations. The omission of any reference to this problem by President Swenson is understandable since the Association he represents contains members who believe there are advantages to the present system. The Committee on Finance and Legislation at its October 1, 1964, meeting "took no position with regard to legislation mandating separate boards for all districts." This difference of position on separation at the local and at the State level is not inconsistent. It is possible to have a separate Division in the Department of Education and permit some Junior Colleges to continue association with the unified District.

Junior College administrators sense some danger in complete separation at the State level. They fear some loss of local control and the possibility that a strong State governing body might become more restrictive than is true under present practices. Reports of disaffection of State College faculties with "centralized" control may have influenced some Junior College educators to re-evaluate their advocacy of a State board. Also influential in bringing about a change in thinking has been conferences with leaders of the Arizona Junior College administrators who have warned their California colleagues that all is not well with a state-controlled system. Perhaps California administrators are discovering that "tyranny" is possible under any system and that the present State Board's preoccupation with the larger elementary and secondary systems gives them a freedom that will be lost with a governing board devoting full attention to Junior College activities. Despite this they favor legislation to repeal the secondary education definition of Junior Colleges.

Faculty associations have been more consistent in their attitude toward the separation at the State and at the local level. At its November 1963 meeting the State Faculty Council of the California Junior College Faculty Association approved a resolution supporting in principle the establishment of a separate State board for Junior Colleges.[19] This is consistent with the position of the Faculty Association and also that of the American Federation of Teachers.

What Junior College educators seem to desire most is a spokesman with the backing of an independent board and with the stature of his counterparts in the other systems of higher education. As one Junior

---

[18] *Testimony Before Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education,* July 10, 1964.

[19] CJCFA, *Bulletin,* January 1964.

College president sees it, "The years ahead demand a clear cut distinction to allow the Junior College to keep in tune with the other segments of higher education."

The existence of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education should allay the fears of those opposed to separation. It is authorized to "Interpret the functional differentiation among the segments [of higher education] . . . and to make recommendations for changes, if needed, in the functions and educational programs of the three public segments." It "is responsible for the study of all aspects of public higher education requiring coordination." In fulfilling these responsibilities, the Coordinating Council can be relied on to give the same consideration to the proper development of the Junior Colleges as it gives to that of the other segments. Occasions when the educational program of the Junior Colleges will be restricted as not proper functions will be strengthened by limitations placed on the other segments. Certainly, no doubt exists that the Council is pressing the State College and University systems to put into effect plans for accomplishing the diversion of students to the Junior Colleges.

Aside from this it is evident that the work of the Council is having an influence in creating for Junior Colleges the concept of a State system of higher education since its deliberations and recommendations include Junior Colleges along with the State College and University systems. The Council's minutes and reports cover the range of educational issues in public higher education. Whether the subject is "level of support", "tuition principles", "probation-dismissal standards", "diversion of students", or "need and source of faculty", the possible effects on Junior Colleges as one of the three systems of public higher education always receives attention.

Although the Council is not an action body, nevertheless, the Junior Colleges are affected by its recommendations to the State Board of Education or to the Legislature. Junior Colleges often act on the recommendations without waiting for official actions. For example, a report on continuing education caused Junior Colleges to re-orient emphasis on those courses in art, music, mathematics and foreign languages that appeared to be professional education in nature. Likewise, study of probation-dismissal policies is causing Junior Colleges to re-examine these policies. Many are anticipating a change in the direction of stricter application.

Given the premise that there will be more coordination, not less, it behooves all concerned to come to an agreement on a workable plan. What are the needs in California, both from the point of view of individual Junior College districts and of the State as a whole, for services and coordination at the State level? Is it logical to expect that the State Board of Education and the Department of Education can fulfill these needs? If not, would it be better to establish a completely separate board and staff or to take an intermediate step with an advisory board and its special staff? Regardless of what agency is designated, what should be its powers and responsibilities and its relationship to local districts? In answering some of these questions is it not possible for the Junior Colleges with the help of the Coordinating Council in cooperation with appropriate State officials, to agree on three or four possibilities with suggested powers, duties, and relationships outlined in a way that they can be assessed?

SECTION III

THE FINANCE OF CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

SUPPORT FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURES[1]

RECOMMENDED LEVEL OF SUPPORT IN THE MASTER PLAN

The Master Plan for Higher Education stated the following in respect to State support of current operating expenditures of the Junior Colleges:

> In view of the added local financial obligations, for both current expenses and capital outlay, which will result from the Master Plan Survey recommendations designed to divert to the junior colleges some 50,000 lower division students from the 1975 estimates for the state colleges and the University of California, and the attendant savings to the state resulting therefrom, the following action is taken:
>
> Procedures and methods be devised and adopted by the Legislature that will increase the proportion of total current support paid to the Junior Colleges from the State School Fund (augmented for this purpose) from the approximately 30 percent now in effect to approximately 45 percent, to be achieved not later than 1975.[2]

The Master Plan recommendation that the State provide 45% of the operating expenditures of Junior Colleges by 1975 has been supported in principle by the Coordinating Council for the past several years. On December 17, 1963, the Council stated:

> That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education advise the Governor and Legislature that in its considered judgment substantially increased financial support from the State of California to the public Junior Colleges is essential to the future success of the Master Plan and the quality and scope of higher education in the State of California and can not longer be delayed.

Further, the Council's *Budget Report to the Legislature, 1964* contains the following comment:

> Consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education and the intent of the recommendations of the State Board of Education, State support to the Junior Colleges in 1964-65 should be increased to 35% of the total current expense of education. This will require the inclusion of approximately $16 million additional in the Governor's Budget for 1964-65.

The Master Plan recommendation that State support of the operating expenditures of Junior Colleges be increased from the 30% estimated in 1960 to 45% by 1965, could have been accomplished by an increase of one percent for each year during the 15-year period.

Table 14 shows the trend in State support for Junior College operations since 1954-55, and compares this trend since 1960 with the level of support recommended in the Master Plan. It must be noted that at the time of Master Plan adoption in 1959, it was impossible to determine the exact percentage of State support for Junior College operating expenditures. Unified and union high school districts maintaining Junior Colleges did not report separate expenditures for Junior College operations, estimates made were based on data available from separate Junior College districts. Since 1961, however, data have been available for *all* Junior Colleges, and as shown in Table 14, the relationship of these data to data for separate Junior College districts indicate that State support of the operational expenditures of all Junior Colleges in 1959 did equal approximately the 30% estimated in the Master Plan.

Table 14 shows a consistent decline in the percentage of State support to Junior Colleges in separate districts from 1954-55 through 1962-63, dropping from 37.45% to 24.02%. After adoption of the Master Plan the percentage of State support for all Junior Colleges declined from the estimated 30% in 1959-60 to 27.25% in 1962-63 — at which time, according to Master Plan recommendations, the percentage should have been 33%. However, in 1963-64 there was a marked increase in the percentage of Junior College current expenditures supported by State funds — an increase to almost 30%, a percentage still below the 34% required to keep pace with Master Plan recommendations.

PROJECTING THE CURRENT EXPENSE FOR EDUCATION AND THE STATE SUPPORT REQUIRED BY MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

In Table 15 the current expense of education in California's public Junior Colleges has been projected through 1975-76 on the basis of three different annual rates of increase in the current expense of education per unit of average daily attendance. A 2% rate has been used as a minimum, a 4% rate as a maximum and a 3% rate as a median — the median rate closely approximating that experienced by Junior Colleges in separate districts during the period 1954-55 to date. It should be noted that the projected

---

[1] This material is taken in part from a paper prepared by Dr. Henry Tyler.

[2] *Master Plan*, p. 13.

TABLE 14

Current Expense of Education, Apportionment From the State School Fund, and Apportionment from the State School Fund as a Percent of the Current Expense of Education Both Actual and as Recommended by the Master Plan (1954 through 1964)

Fiscal year	Current expense		State support		State support as a percent of current expense		
	Separate junior college districts[1]	All junior college districts[2]	Separate junior college districts[3]	All junior college districts	Separate junior college districts	All junior college districts	Master plan recommendation
1954-55	$26,711,332	N/A	$10,003,947	--	37.45	--	
55-56	30,284,377	N/A	11,084,324	--	36.60	--	
56-57	35,855,888	N/A	11,323,132	--	31.58	--	
57-58	43,403,589	N/A	12,979,153	--	29.90	--	
58-59	50,380,947	N/A	14,188,959	--	28.16	--	
59-60	56,257,967	N/A	15,158,553	--	26.94	[a]30.00	30.00
60-61	64,785,649	N/A	16,336,398	--	25.22	--	31.00
61-62	76,433,769	$112,558,469	19,108,736	$30,938,619	25.00	27.49	32.00
62-63	94,687,426	125,151,721	23,741,227	34,104,010	24.02	27.25	33.00
63-64	105,718,537	141,114,367	30,633,364	41,343,182	28.98	29.30	34.00

[1] SOURCE: **Annual Report of Financial Transactions Concerning School Districts of California**, State Controller, fiscal years 1954-55 through 1962-63. From Bureau of School Apportionments, Department of Education for 1963-64.

[2] SOURCE: Bureau of School Apportionments, Department of Education.

[3] SOURCE: Apportionment of State School Fund, Department of Education. Amounts shown in the apportionment books have been adjusted to reflect the net of tuition transfers as reported in Controller's Report of Financial Transactions.

[a] Estimated.

average daily attendance — and therefore the projected cost — reflect the planned diversion of potential lower division students from the University of California and the California State Colleges until the ratio of lower division to upper division enrollment reaches 40-60 in the two four-year segments in 1975.

At the minimum rate of increase the current expense of education will increase from $141.1 million in 1963-64 to $414.5 million in 1975-76 — an increase of almost 294%—while at the maximum rate the increase will be to $522.7 million — an increase of 370%. The median increase to $466 million represents a percentage increase of 330%.

The State and local share of each of the three projected current expenditures of education for each of the years from 1964-65 through 1975-76 is shown in Table 16. In 1964-65 the State share determined by the foundation program now in effect, will be approximately $53.2 million, which will again increase the State's percentage of support over that for the previous year. This percentage of support will range from 30.88% to 30.29% depending upon the projected current expense of education used. Beginning in 1965-66 the State's share is based upon the percentage required each year if the State share is to reach 45% of the expenditure by 1975 as recommended in the Master Plan. The data show that if the State is to assume a 45% share of the expenditure in 1975-76 the State allocation will have to increase almost 400% over that for 1964-65. At the same time, however, the local share will increase only slightly over 200%.

The average property tax rate that would be required each year to fund each of the projected current expenditures for education is shown in Table 17, shown in terms of cents per $100 of assessed valuation. (It should be remembered that the current expenditure includes costs for diverted students and that the assumption is made that by 1970 all territory of the state will be included in a Junior College district.) Up to 1970 the percentage of statewide assessed valuation in districts maintaining Junior Colleges will increase the current 81.1% at a rate of 2.8% annually.

Table 17 shows that in districts operating Junior Colleges the average tax rate required to fund the local share of the current expense of education each year will increase through 1964–65 and then decrease up to 1975-76 as the State assumes (at an increase of 1% each year) 45% of the current expenses of education by that time, and as a greater percentage of the assessed valuation of the State is contained in districts operating junior colleges. On a statewide basis the average tax rate remains relatively constant over the ten-year period.

THE CURRENT SUPPORT PROGRAM

The current program through which the State and local Junior College districts jointly support the Junior Colleges provides that: (1) each district be assured a minimum amount of State support; (2) each district make a reasonable effort to support its college through a local tax levy and (3) each district receive from the State whatever additional sum is necessary to bring the total support to a level presumed necessary to operate a reasonable adequate program. This basicly simple program has accumulated through the years complicating characteristics. These complexities have become so confusing to the concerned citizen or legislator — and even to many Junior College educators — that they often give up attempting either to understand or improve the support program. These complexities have also made it extremely difficult to describe the current support program without confusing the reader with too much detail. It is hoped that the explanation which follows avoids this difficulty and provides only that detail required for understanding.

State Support. State financial support for Junior College current operations is authorized under provisions of the State Constitution and is provided through a foundation program established by statute. Through the foundation program each district is assured of a certain amount of State support called "basic aid," and some districts may, under certain conditions, receive additional State support called "equalization aid".

Basic aid is received by a district for units of student attendance, called "average daily attendance (a.d.a.)[3], at a rate of $125 for each unit. The amount received is based on the attendance of all students.

Equalization aid, if received by a district, is also based upon units of average daily attendance but is provided only for the a.d.a. of certain categories of

---

[3] One unit of a.d.a. is equivalent to one student in attendance 15 class hours each week during the year. (If all 15 class hours are in non-laboratory courses, such a student is considered to be a full-time equivalent (F.T.E.). If a part of the 15 class hours are in laboratory courses such a student is counted as less than a F.T.E. student.)

TABLE 15

Actual and Projected Current Expenditures of Education for Public Junior Colleges—1961–62 to 1975–76

Fiscal year (1)	Average daily attendance (in thousands)		Current expense of education (actual) (in millions)	Current expense of education per a.d.a.				Projected current expense based upon a projected increase in current expense per a.d.a. (in millions)		
					Projected†					
	Actual	Projected*		Actual	2 percent increase per year	3 percent increase per year	4 percent increase per year	2 percent increase (Col. 3 × Col. 6)	3 percent increase (Col. 3 × Col. 7)	4 percent increase (Col. 3 × Col. 8)
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1961–62	202		$112.6	$558.36						
1962–63	215		125.2	581.82						
1963–64	246		141.1	573.65						
1964–65		294			$585.12	$590.86	$596.60	$172.3	$173.9	$175.6
1965–66		338			596.82	608.58	620.46	201.9	205.9	209.9
1966–67		369			608.76	626.84	645.28	224.7	231.4	238.2
1967–68		391			620.94	645.64	671.09	242.8	252.4	262.4
1968–69		403			633.36	665.00	697.93	255.3	268.1	281.3
1969–70		423			646.03	684.95	725.85	273.3	289.7	307.0
1970–71		450			658.95	705.50	754.88	296.4	317.3	339.5
1971–72		476			672.13	726.67	785.08	320.0	345.9	373.7
1972–73		502			685.57	748.47	816.48	343.8	375.4	409.5
1973–74		518			699.28	770.92	849.14	361.9	399.0	439.4
1974–75		544			713.26	794.05	882.06	388.0	431.9	479.8
1975–76		570			727.52	817.87	917.34	414.5	466.0	522.7

* SOURCE: State Department of Finance. The estimates reflect the planned diversion of potential lower division students at the University of California and the California State College until the ratio of lower division enrollment to upper division enrollment reaches 40%: 60% in 1975.

† The 3% rate is that actually experienced by separate Junior College districts in the period 1945-55 to date. The 2% and 4% rates are applied as minimum and maximum growth rates.

TABLE 16

Actual and Projected State and Local Shares of the Current Expenditure of Education for Public Junior Colleges, 1961–62 to 1975–76

Fiscal year	Current expense of education				State share						Local share					
		Based upon a projected increase in expense/a.d.a. (in millions)			Actual		Projected (in millions)				Actual		Projected (in millions)			
	Actual (in millions)	Based on 2 percent increase	Based on 3 percent increase	Based on 4 percent increase	Amount (in millions)	Percent	Percent*	Based on 2 percent increase	Based on 3 percent increase	Based on 4 percent increase	Amount (in millions)	Percent	Percent	Based on 2 percent increase	Based on 3 percent increase	Based on 4 percent increase
1961–62	$112.6				$30.9	27.49					$81.6	72.51				
1962–63	125.2				34.1	27.25					91.0	72.75				
1963–64	141.1				41.3	29.30					99.8	70.72				
1964–65		$172.3	$173.9	$175.6			X†	$53.2	$53.2	$53.2			X†	$119.0	$120.7	$122.4
1965–66		201.9	205.9	209.9			36	72.7	74.1	75.6			64	129.2	131.8	134.3
1966–67		224.7	231.4	238.2			37	83.1	85.6	88.1			63	141.6	145.8	150.0
1967–68		242.8	252.4	262.4			38	92.2	95.9	99.7			62	150.5	156.5	162.7
1968–69		255.3	268.1	281.3			39	99.6	104.5	109.7			61	155.7	163.5	171.6
1969–70		273.3	289.7	307.0			40	109.3	115.9	122.8			60	164.0	173.8	184.2
1970–71		296.4	317.3	339.5			41	121.5	130.1	139.2			59	174.9	187.2	200.3
1971–72		320.0	345.9	373.7			42	134.4	145.3	157.0			58	185.6	200.6	216.8
1972–73		343.8	375.4	409.5			43	147.8	161.4	176.1			57	196.0	214.0	233.4
1973–74		361.9	399.0	439.4			44	159.2	175.5	193.4			56	202.7	223.4	246.1
1974–75		388.0	431.9	479.8			45	174.6	194.4	215.9			55	213.4	237.6	263.9
1975–76		414.5	466.0	522.7			45	186.5	209.7	235.2			55	228.0	256.3	287.5

* State percentage increased each year so as to reach 45% (as recommended in Master Plan) by 1974-75.

† The Department of Education's Bureau of School Apportionment estimated the apportionment in 1964–65, based upon the $600 Foundation Program and the 1963–64 a.d.a., would be $44.4 million. If this is reduced to an amount per a.d.a. ($180,696) and this is multiplied by the a.d.a. estimated for 1964–65, the estimated State support in 1964–65 = $53.2 million. This would provide 30.88% support towards the 2% increase in cost, 30.58% toward the 3% increase in cost and 30.29% toward the 4% increase in cost.

TABLE 17

Average Property Tax Rate Required to Fund Local Share of Actual and Projected Current Expense of Education California Public Junior Colleges 1961–62 to 1975–76

Fiscal year	Local share of current expense of education				Assessed valuation (billions)		Tax rate required to fund local share‡					
	Percent	Amount (millions)			Districts* operating a junior college	Statewide†	In district operating a junior college			Statewide		
	Actual	Actual			Actual	Actual	Actual			Actual		
1961–62	72.51	$81.6			$23.8	$31.5	34.37¢			25.88¢		
1962–63	72.75	91.0			26.1	33.3	34.84			27.32		
1963–64	70.72	99.8			28.4	35.0	35.18			28.44		
		Projected					Projected			Projected		
	Projected	Low[1]	Medium[2]	High[3]	Projected	Projected	Low[1]	Medium[2]	High[3]	Low[1]	Medium[2]	High[3]
1964–65	X[4]	$119.0	$120.7	$122.4	$32.6	$38.8	36.50¢	37.02¢	37.55¢	30.69¢	31.13¢	31.57¢
1965–66	64	129.2	131.8	134.3	36.3	41.9	35.59	36.31	37.00	30.82	31.43	32.04
1966–67	63	141.6	145.8	150.0	40.5	45.2	34.96	36.00	37.03	31.28	32.21	33.16
1967–68	62	150.5	156.5	162.7	44.9	48.6	33.52	34.86	36.24	30.94	32.73	33.44
1968–69	61	155.7	163.5	171.6	49.7	52.3	31.33	32.90	34.53	29.80	31.28	32.83
1969–70	60	164.0	173.8	184.2	55.0	56.2	29.82	31.60	33.49	29.20	30.96	32.81
1970–71	59	174.9	187.2	200.3	60.2	60.2	29.05	31.10	33.28	29.05	31.10	33.28
1971–72	58	185.6	200.6	216.8	64.6	64.6	28.73	31.06	33.56	28.73	31.06	33.56
1972–73	57	196.0	214.0	233.4	69.1	69.1	28.35	30.95	33.76	28.35	30.95	33.76
1973–74	56	202.7	223.4	246.1	74.9	74.9	27.07	29.84	32.87	27.07	29.84	32.87
1975–75	55	213.4	237.6	263.9	80.3	80.3	26.59	29.60	32.98	26.59	29.60	32.98
1975–76	55	228.0	256.3	287.5	86.0	86.0	26.51	29.80	33.42	26.51	29.80	33.42

† SOURCE: 1966 to 1972 Stanford Research Institute, Statistical Appendix to: **Financing Public School Education in California** June 1963, p. 241. Projections for 1973–75 are extrapolations.

‡ Cents per $100 of assessed valuation.

[1] Based on a 2% annual increase in current expense of education per a.d.a.

[2] Based on a 3% annual increase in current expense of education per a.d.a.

[3] Based on a 4% annual increase in current expense of education per a.d.a.

[4] The Department of Education's Bureau of School Apportionment estimated the apportionment in 1964–65, based upon the $600 Foundation Program and the 1963–64 a.d.a., would be $44.4 million. If this is reduced to an amount per a.d.a. ($180,696) and this is multiplied by the a.d.a. estimated for 1964–65, the estimated State support in 1964–65 = $53.2 million. This would provide 30.88% support towards the 2% increase in cost, 30.58% toward the 3% increase in cost and 30.29% toward the 4% increase in cost.

* Projected assessed valuation derived as follows:

Year	Statewide assessed valuation (billions)	Assessed valuation in districts maintaining junior colleges (billions)	District assessed valuation as a percent of statewide assessed valuation
1957	$24.3	$17.0	70.0
1958	26.0	18.3	70.4
1959	27.4	19.3	70.4
1960	29.6	20.8	70.3
1961	31.5	23.8	75.6
1962	33.3	26.1	78.4
1963	35.0	28.4	81.1

As seen above, the percentage of Statewide assessed valuation in districts maintaining junior colleges increased from 70% in 1957 to 81.1% in 1963. During the last two years of this period the rate of increase was about 2.8% each year. If this rate of increase is projected the percentage will reach 100% by 1970. If the projected percentage of the statewide assessed valuation which lies in districts maintaining junior colleges each year is multiplied by the projected statewide assessed valuation for that year the projected assessed valuation in districts maintaining junior colleges is obtained. These amounts will be the same in 1970 and beyond.

students and the rate per unit of a.d.a. differs for each category—the exact rates depending upon the wealth of the district. To explain the computation of equalization aid it is first necessary to define these categories. The total a.d.a. of a district is accumulated in two basic categories. One of these categories includes those students who are over 21 years of age and are enrolled in *less* than ten class hours per week. This category will be referred to below as "adults". The other category includes all other students and will be referred to below as "minors" even though the category includes those students over 21 years of age who are enrolled for *ten or more* class hours per week. In both categories the a.d.a. are accumulated separately for those students who reside in the district and those who do not. Enrollments are accumulated therefore, in terms of "in-district minors", "in-district adults", "out-of-district minors", and "out-of-district adults". In-district a.d.a. generally accounts for the larger share of a district's total a.d.a. (86% of the total statewide units of a.d.a. were so classified in 1963–64), and in-district minors generally account for the larger share of a district's in-district a.d.a. (78.8% of the total statewide units of a.d.a. were so classified in 1963–64).

Equalization aid is received by a district for the a.d.a. of its in-district minors if the financial resources of the district, along with State basic aid for in-district minor a.d.a. does not produce the funds considered necessary for an "adequate educational program". At the present time the cost of such a program for in-district minors has been determined, by legislative action, to be $600 for each unit of their a.d.a. This cost, known as the *foundation amount,* was increased from $425 to $543 in 1961, to $570 in 1963, and to $600 in 1964, and is based upon an estimate of the average total current expense of education per unit of total a.d.a. To determine the exact amount of equalization aid, if any, a district will receive for its in-district minors, the $125 per unit of a.d.a. provided by the State as basic aid is added to an amount per unit of a.d.a. (of in-district minors) contributed by the district. The district's contribution per unit of a.d.a. is determined by applying a computational tax of 25¢ against the assessed valuation of the district and dividing the amount by the in-district minor a.d.a. If this total (basic aid plus district's contribution) does not equal the foundation amount of $600, the difference, called "equalization aid" is provided by the State for each unit of the district's "in-district minor" a.d.a.

Equalization aid for the a.d.a. of in-district adults is provided at a lower unit rate than for in-district minor a.d.a. It is received by a district if the financial resources of the district, along with the basic aid provided by the State for the a.d.a. of in-district adults, does not produce funds equal to $490 ($480 in 1963) for each unit of their a.d.a. This $490 can be referred to as the "foundation amount" for in-district adults. To determine the exact amount of equalization aid, if any, the district will receive for the a.d.a. of these in-district adults, the $125 per unit of their a.d.a. provided by the State as basic aid is added to an amount per unit of a.d.a. of in-district minors contributed by the district. The district's contribution is determined by the application of a computational tax of 24¢ against the assessed valuation of the district. If this total does not equal $490, the difference, up to $105, is provided by the State as equalization aid for each unit of the a.d.a. of in-district adults. The total State aid for in-district adults, however, may not exceed $230 ($220 in 1963) times the current in-district adult a.d.a.

Sample Computation of State Support. The computation of State funds allocated to a Junior College district through the foundation program is illustrated below for a district eligible for equalization aid.

Average Daily Attendance

	Previous Year	*Current*
Minors		
In-district	1,661	1,541
Out-of-district	1,567	1,982
Total	3,228	3,523
Defined Adults		
In-district	460	455
Out-of-district	255	297
Total	715	752
Total		
In-district	2,121	1,996
Out-of-district	1,822	2,279
Total	3,943	4,275

Assessed Valuation

$130,699,800

Computation of Basic Aid

($125 × current district a.d.a. exclusive of a.d.a. for in-district adults plus, $125 × previous year's a.d.a. for in-district adults)

$$\begin{aligned} \$125 \times 3{,}820 &= \$477{,}500 \\ \$125 \times 460 &= \underline{57{,}500} \\ &\ \$535{,}000 \end{aligned}$$

Computation of Equalization Aid for In-District Minors

Eligibility:

(Sum of basic aid per unit of in-district minor a.d.a. and district contribution per unit of in-district minor a.d.a. must be less than $600. Unit amount of district contribution is computed by multiplying the district's assessed valuation by a computational tax of $.25 and dividing by in-district minor a.d.a.)

$$\$125 + \frac{\$130{,}699{,}800 \times \$.0025}{1541}$$

$$= \$125 + \$212.04 = \$337.04$$

Amount:

(Difference between the foundation amount—$600—and the eligibility amount—$337—, multiplied by the in-district minor a.d.a.)

$$\$600 - \$337.04 = \$262.96$$

$$\$262.96 \times 1{,}541 = \$405{,}221$$

Computation of Equalization Aid for In-District Adults

Eligibility:

(Sum of basic aid per unit of a.d.a.—$125—and district contribution per unit of in-district minor a.d.a. must be less than $490. Unit amount of district contribution is computed by multiplying the district's assessed valuation by a computational tax of $.25 and dividing by in-district *minor* a.d.a.)

$$\$125 + \frac{\$130{,}699{,}800 \times \$.0024}{1541}$$

$$= \$125 + \$203.63 = \$328.63$$

Amount:

(The difference, *up to $105,* between the foundation amount—$490—and the eligibility amount—$328.63—multiplied by the in-district adult a.d.a. The equalization aid will be reduced, if necessary, so that the combined basic aid for adults and equalization aid for adults does not exceed \$230, times the current in-district adult a.d.a.)

\$490 — \$328.63 = \$161.37
\$105 × 455 = \$47,775

Total State Support

Basic Aid	\$535,000
Equalization Aid	
In-district minors	\$405,221
In-district adults	47,775
Total	\$987,996

District Support. A district may levy a general purpose tax of 35¢—including the 25¢district computational tax upon which the foundation program for in-district minors is based—for the support of Junior College operational expenditures, and may levy a general purpose tax in excess of the 35¢ if a simple voting majority of the electorate of the district approve. Further, every district may levy certain "special purpose" taxes—called permissive overrides—the income from which is restricted to such expenditures as teachers retirement, health and welfare benefits, community services, adult education purposes, and interdistrict attendance.

Other Support. A further source of revenue for Junior College operation besides the State and district shares is ***out-of-district tuitition.*** Such charges are not paid by the student. Rather, the district in which the student attends bills the county in which he legally resides for the actual cost per a.d.a., less the amount (basic aid only) received from the State. A charge (currently \$300 per a.d.a.) is also made for use of the college facilities. In each county from which students residing in territory not in a school district maintaining a Junior College have attended a Junior College, the "junior college tuition tax" bills are annually totaled, and the County Supervisors levy a tax on property not in a district maintaining a Junior College sufficient to raise the needed sum. These taxes vary rather widely from county to county and from year to year. Certain parts of the State, remote from Junior Colleges, and from which few students attend, usually pay a very low tuition tax.[4]

Since recent legislation states that it is the Legislature's intent that all high school districts become components of districts maintaining Junior Colleges, and non-district areas are rapidly being reduced, this revenue source will probably terminate within the next several years, being replaced by the assessed valuation which such areas represent. The proportion of the state's total wealth which is available for tax levies by local boards of Junior Colleges, is rising steadily, now standing at approximately 80%.

Federal funds have generally comprised no more than about 2% of total Junior College income statewide, but in certain districts may be quite significant. They are paid for reimbursable vocational programs (Smith-Hughes, George-Braden, etc.) on a federal-state matching basis, for federally impacted areas in lieu of local taxes (P.L. 874) and for a few other situations. Recent federal legislation, including the extension and broadening of the National Defense Education Act, Manpower Development and Training Act, Vocational Education Act, Nurse Training Act, and Economic Opportunities Act will considerably increase the amounts and presumably also the proportion of total income that derives from Washington.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE CURRENT SUPPORT PROGRAM

Complex though the present California plan for local and State sharing of the cost of Junior College operations may be, it has good features. Foremost among these are the assurance of an annual apportionment, the guarantee of funds roughly equivalent to unit costs, and partial equalization.

The main disadvantage of the current program is its complexity and the confusion that surrounds it. Much of this complexity has come about through the years because of an effort to take care of special problems arising from such factors as the number of different types of districts supporting Junior Colleges and the difficulty of obtaining comparable data on school finance from diverse districts—particularly, as shown in Table 18, when district organization changes rapidly over a period of years.

TABLE 18

Number of Districts, by Type, Maintaining Junior Colleges

Year	*JC District*	*Unified District*	*HS District*	*Total*
1954	20	12	20	52
1955	22	12	20	52
1956	23	12	18	53
1957	26	12	18	56
1958	27	12	17	56
1959	28	12	17	57
1960	30	12	15	57
1961	39	12	9	60
1962	49	11	5	65
1963	54	8	2	64
1964	56	8	2	66

SOURCE: Annual Apportionment Reports and Bureau of Junior College Education.

A second disadvantage of the current system results from support based upon the age of a student—be he adult or so-called minor—without regard to the type and cost of the class the student attends. The result is that a large percentage of a.d.a is supported at a unit rate applicable to ungraded classes, although, the a.d.a comes from attendance in graded classes where unit costs are much higher.

A third disadvantage is the inability of the program to provide fully equalized educational opportunity and fully equalized educational costs to those supporting the program.

The assessed valuation per in-district minor a.d.a in districts maintaining Junior Colleges varies currently from a low of about $50,000 to a high of over $600,000.[5] Under current foundation formulas many of the wealthier districts can finance a superior program on their basic State aid of $125 and a tax rate of well below the 35¢ tax ceiling. At the same time the least wealthy even with a 35¢ tax, may be very little above the foundation level.

---

[4] See Table I, Appendix.

INCREASING STATE ASSISTANCE WITHIN THE CURRENT SUPPORT PROGRAM

The ways by which State assistance to the Junior Colleges could be increased within the present method of financing are breifly pointed out below:

Basic Aid. Basic aid, as established by the Constitution at $120 per unit of a.d.a., was increased by the Legislature several years ago to $125. This $125, as explained previously, is guaranteed to each Junior College district for every unit of a.d.a. If the amount of basic aid per unit of a.d.a. were increased it would provide additional State dollars to every district of the state.

Equalization Aid. If the *foundation amount* for in-district minors were to be increased beyond the current $600 per unit of a.d.a., and if the foundation amount for in-district adults were to be increased beyond the current $490 per unit of a.d.a., additional State funds would be provided to those districts already receiving equalization aid. Other districts would qualify for equalization aid if State basic aid and their local resources did not meet the increased foundation amount. If the *computational tax* used to determine district eligibility for equalization aid for in-district minors was reduced from the current 25¢, and if the computational tax used to determine disstrict eligibility for equalization aid for in-district adults was reduced from the current 24¢, additional State funds would be provided for equalization aid and more districts would share in these funds.

Defined Adults. As pointed out previously in this section, State support for the average daily attendance derived from those students defined as adults is at a lower rate than for the a.d.a. of those students defined as ''minors.'' The definition of an adult was established in 1953 by Section 6352, *Education Code.* If this definition were to be eliminated and support provided at the same rate for those students now defined as adults as those students now defined as minors, a substantial increase in State support would result.

METHOD OF SUPPORT IN OTHER STATES

How do other states support their junior colleges? A 1962 bulletin by Morrison and Martorana[6] indicates that in 1962 forty-two states had public Junior Colleges financed in a variety of ways which may be combined into three major groupings:

(1) Specific formulas

These formulas determine the state's contribution to the current support budget. The majority base this formula on a dollar amount per student enrolled although a few set the state share as a proportion of the current operating cost.

(2) Legislative appropriations

These are either annual or biennial appropriations and are apparently based upon budgetary proposals.

(3) Local tax levies.

The same bulletin also comments as follows:

1. A number of states follow the practice of dividing operating costs among the local district, the state, and the student, with some tendency toward a pattern of equal shares.
2. Three states provide 50 to 74% of the current support for local Junior Colleges, 14 states furnish 25 to 49% of the current support, 4 states less than 25%, and 8 states give no support to local colleges.
3. Increasingly, state tax funds are being looked to as the chief source of support.
4. Student tuition payments have been kept at a minimum level—one-third of the operating costs or less.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE CURRENT PROGRAM OF SUPPORT

James Wattenbarger,[7] Director, Community Colleges Division, Florida State Department of Education, has described characteristics of a sound plan for financing public Junior Colleges. Extracting only those aspects which relate to current operation, we find:

1. The plan should provide for joint responsibility, with both the state and the locality assuming a share. An essential part of this joint support should be an equalization measure which would assure the same basic quality of education in all of the colleges.
2. The plan should depend upon student tuition fees as little as possible. It is a contradiction to talk about extending educational opportunities to people on the one hand and how large the tuition fee may be on the other.
3. The plan should be based upon a formula which provides for all elements of necessary costs of a good community college program. The formula must recognize that small schools cost more per

---

[5] See Table II, Appendix.

[6] D. G. Morrison and S. V. Martorana, "State Formulas for the Support of Colleges," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1962, No. 14.

[7] "Establishing Legal Bases for Community Colleges." American Association of Junior Colleges, 1962.

student than large schools, that certain administrative and counseling services are essential, that some types of programs are more expensive, and that provision must be made for rapid enrollment increases. The plan should encourage efficiency and general improvement in the operation of the college.

4. The plan should contribute to stability of operation by providing a predictable income from year to year.
5. A sound plan will recognize that responsibility for record keeping, auditing procedures, and fiscal control is a joint responsibility shared by a state coordinating agency as well as the institution itself. However, as great an amount of flexibility as possible in the administration of the budget is essential.
6. The plan will not be dependent upon gifts or donations to provide sufficient funds for the basic program of instruction. Grants or gifts should be considered as a supplement to the regular public support.
7. The plan should induce areas of the state not directly participating in the support of a Junior College to make their contributions on a basis related to the number of their own residents who attend. (As Wattenbarger infers later in his statement, it would be desirable for this to be mandatory in order that costs may be shared equitably.)

There are, it would appear, principally five sources of funds for California public Junior Colleges—the federal government, State government, local Junior College districts, the student, private individuals and organizations. Any support program must be built around one or more of these sources. Since the State has no means of increasing federal or private support for the Junior Colleges the support programs listed below involve the remaining three sources and assume the current level federal and private support will continue.

(1) Complete State support—This program could be patterned after the approach used in the support of the California State Colleges and University of California (probably more closely to the State Colleges.) The following procedures would have to be considered.
    (a) Centralized review of budget and educational programs.
    (b) Development of a uniform salary structure for all Junior Colleges.
    (c) A new relationship of local boards of control to centralized control.
(2) State and student support—This program could be similar to the one suggested above with the addition of either:
    (a) Student fees for student services patterned after the fee system in the other two segments of higher education, or
    (b) A tuition system that would greatly increase the proportion of student support.
(3) State and local support—This program is best illustrated through the current foundation program for California public Junior Colleges. There are alternatives to a foundation program. One variation could be a determination that the State provide a fixed percentage of the operating costs of each Junior College.
(4) State, local and student support—A program built around these three sources could be a variation on the current foundation program. It could allow the student to assume a share of support through student fees similar to those charged by the State Colleges and the university. (A variation could be to charge tuition to all students with an earned AA or higher degree.)
(5) Complete local support.
(6) Local and student support.
(7) Complete student support.

Complete State or complete local support does not appear probable. Both would be stoutly resisted, the first by the Legislature and State agencies, the second by local taxpayers groups. Besides, the principle of local-State sharing is deeply entrenched, is followed almost everywhere over the nation (either with or without tuition charges), and draws on different sources of revenue. Proposals to introduce tuition as an income source are being encountered, and may be expected to increase as enrollments and costs mount.

If the local-State sharing plan with no tuition charge is continued, a basis for determining the State's share is needed. The Master Plan recommendation that the State share should approach, but stop short of 50% was made with the belief that as long as over half of the support was from local sources, the danger of State control would be lessened. How valid is this belief, is difficult to determine. *Education Code*, section 17503, which mandates the manner in which 50% of a district budget must be spent, even though most of its funds may have come from local taxes, would seem to have made the point that the State can dictate how local funds shall be used. If this be true, State control may be a possibility regardless of the proportion of state versus local support.

The idea of a specific percentage base for determining the level of State support to districts subject to local boards of control has been criticized. It has been argued that this commits the State to an "open-ended" situation that continually "escalates", that the more State money a district gets, the more the local board and administration will spend, thus an upward spiral results. Instead, a proper or adequate "program," should be determined which will include designated salary schedules, student-faculty ratios, and other elements; once the cost of this is determined, then a dollar amount for the State's contribution can be fixed.

Junior College educators have argued that such an approach would produce unrealistic and undesirable uniformity, in view of the diversity over the state in community needs, living costs, program emphasis, etc., which are the components of any adequate junior college service to its area. They believe that average costs on a statewide basis provide a suitably stable base and also that local administrations and boards show fully as great fiscal responsibility as do State agencies.

ISSUES TO BE FACED IN THE DETERMINATION OF A SUPPORT PROGRAM

If California is to have an understandable and defensible plan of financing its Junior Colleges, a number of issues must be resolved. Some of these are:

(1) Shall Junior Colleges continue to receive State funds through apportionment? If so,
  (a) Should the foundation program, if continued, closely approximate the estimated per student cost or be determined on another basis?
  (b) What approximate proportion of Junior College support should the State provide? What is the rationale for this?
  (c) Shall basic aid be continued? At the present level? Higher? Lower? If it were abolished, what alternate plan is suggested?

(2) How can all areas of the state be brought into equitable sharing in support of Junior Colleges?
  (a) Is a statewide tax levy for Junior College support feasible? If it were adopted, what would be its impact on local control?
  (b) How may all territories of the state be quickly brought into districts maintaining Junior Colleges, thus ending complexities of charge-back?

(3) Should the "defined adult" limitation be removed?
  (a) From graded class attendance?
  (b) From ungraded class attendance?

(4) Should there be differentials in the proportion of State support for—
  (a) Graded versus ungraded courses?
  (b) Persons already having AA (or other) degrees and those without?
  (c) Others?

(5) How may inter-district financing be best arranged so as to encourage regional planning and facilitate legitimate student transfer?

(6) Should ceilings on allowable local tax levy be raised or removed?

(7) How may the necessarily higher-than-average unit costs in small Junior Colleges be better supported?

(8) Can a continuing plan be adopted that will obviate present annual uncertainties until last-minute action by the Legislature?

(9) What impact on local control of Junior Colleges will each support plan have?

(10) Should a State system of Junior Colleges, replacing the present locally-controlled institutions, be advocated?

A support plan might be devised that would start with verified current statewide average costs, provide for an annual increase tied to the cost of living index, and include a reasonable proportion as the State's "proper" share. But how shall this "proper" share be determined? There is precedent from the practices of other states and of the federal government, for a fifty-fifty matching. It can readily be argued that Junior Colleges perform a State function, especially in view of present-day mobility of populations. The student, no matter where educated, is as likely as not to spend his adult life in one or several communities other than that in which he went to Junior College. Further, since Junior Colleges educate a sizable proportion of students who as freshmen were eligible to have entered a State College, the University, or both—in which case the State would have paid either some 85–90% of State College costs or 65–70% of University costs—it can be argued that for such students the State should pay these full amounts to the Junior College. Thus, an open-ended State Junior College fund could be established into which annually would be placed sums based on the amounts those University and State College eligible students in Junior Colleges would have cost the State had they gone to those institutions, together with, say, 50% of the amount estimated for the costs of educating the remaining "non-eligible" Junior College students. Distribution of such a fund could be on a foundation basis, or could separately identify the three classifications of students since by recent State Board of Education action Junior Colleges will now be annually reporting the number of University and State College eligibles enrolled. Were such a plan to be adopted, it would be imperative to prescribe that the funds be distributed irrespective of the courses pursued by the students of each category, since not all "eligibles" may elect to take transfer courses and many "ineligibles" do, in fact, transfer.

If such a continuing Junior College State fund were established, thought might well be given to legislation that would levy a minimum annual tax of 35¢ on non-district areas, the sums thus raised, if in excess of those required by counties for paying their Junior College tuition tax bills, going into the Junior College State fund. This would bring all parts of the state into more similar participation in Junior College support, and would provide further incentive to non-district areas to form or annex to Junior College districts, in accordance with declared legislative intent.

A different approach to the state-local sharing might be the Arizona plan. There the state pays $525 per student for the first 320 student units and $350 for all the remaining student units. Because of California's great diversity in unit wealth, by district, and its resulting devotion to the principle of equalization, that feature could be incorporated in the plan. Thus, for example, the first, say, 500 A.D.A. (or other unit) might be on a foundation basis of perhaps $800, and all above that on, perhaps, $600. By carefully adjusting the two amounts, such a plan could overcome one great weakness of the present program, whereby districts that are both relatively "poor" and small in enrollment can raise only a few dollars above the foundation program to finance their inescapably greater-than-average unit costs.

The possibility of a statewide property tax levied for Junior College purposes and placed, together with support from the State School Fund in a State Junior College Fund, merits careful study. When advocated by the State Department of Education recently,[8] many believed that it was not feasible politically; this may be true. By obtaining money from wealthy districts and allocating it equally to all districts, equalization would be increased. Opposition from the wealthier districts may, however, be expected. Further examination of the plan may well be warranted.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN JUNIOR COLLEGE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR 1965–66

The State Board of Education and the Department of Education have provided some indication of the legislation affecting Junior College support which they will propose or support during the 1965 session of the Legislature. The California Junior College Association has issued a statement on its legislative program.

The State Board of Education has indicated that it may seek to eliminate "State Basic Aid" from the Junior College foundation program. Such a change (requiring a constitutional amendment) would result in a decreased percentage of State support to the Junior Colleges unless other compensating changes were made in the foundation porgram. Without such changes the amount of State support would remain unchanged for all districts with an assessed valuation per unit of in-district, minor a.d.a. of $190,000 or less. Those districts, in which the assessed valuation per unit of a.d.a. is between $190,000 and $240,000 would become eligible for equalization aid, but the amount of equalization aid received would be somewhat less than basic aid now received. All districts with an assessed valuation of $240,000 or more per unit of a.d.a. would receive no State support. The total loss to the Junior Colleges in State support would be between $3 and $4 million.

The State Board may also consider supporting a statewide property tax to equalize State aid to the Junior Colleges and the elimination of section 6352 of the *Education Code*, which defines adults. It can be assumed that a proposal for a statewide tax would be similar to the one considered by the State Board and Department during the 1963 Session of the Legislature. However, further information on both the statewide tax and redefinition of adults is required for detailed analysis of the proposals.

The State Department of Education has indicated it will recommend that the current foundation program for Junior Colleges be left unchanged except for the elimination of the definition of adults in the *Education Code* (section 6352) and the shifting of the in-district adult a.d.a. derived from enrollment in graded classes to the foundation program for in-district minors ($600 foundation program). The remaining adult a.d.a. would continue to be supported through the foundation program for adults.

The State support required in 1965–66 to fund the Junior College support program with the change recommended by the Department would be approximately $77.7 million, or some $16.5 million more than $61.2 million that will be required to fund the foundation program without such a change.

The California Junior College Association has indicated it will make two legislative proposals for the 1965 Session of the Legislature. One proposal wil be to reduce the computational tax used in that part of the foundation program related to in-district minors from the present 25¢ per $100 of assessed valuation to 20¢ and the second will be to eliminate the definition of adults as stated in Section 6352 of the *Education Code* with the eliminated a.d.a. supported in the same manner as recommended by the State Department of Education.

The State support required for the Junior College support program with the computational tax for in-district minors reduced from 25¢ to 20¢ would be some $73.4 million, or $12.2 million more than the estimated $61.2 million required in State support without such a change. The State support required to fund both proposals taken together would be almost $95.1 million or approximately $40 million more than the $61.2 million required without the two changes.

---

[8] *Recommendations on Public School Support* (Sacramento: State Department of Education, November 1962), pp 49–57.

SUPPORT FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE CAPITAL OUTLAY: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The Master Plan included provisions for increased support not only for operations but for capital outlay for the Junior Colleges in view of the added local financial obligations that would result from other Master Plan provisions designed to divert some 50,000 students to the junior colleges by 1975. Specifically, the Master Plan provided in respect to capital outlay support:

> A continuing program be devised and adopted by the Legislature that would distribute construction funds, either through grants or loans or both, for capital outlay purposes annually to junior colleges as determined by growth, this program being for the purpose of assisting junior colleges to meet the facility needs of projected enrollments and of the students to be diverted to the junior colleges.[9]

In recognizing the growth needs of the Junior Colleges in meeting obligations under the Master Plan, the Legislature established a temporary program for Junior College tax relief for capital outlay purposes, appropriating $5 million in 1961 and approving a similar amount in the 1962–63 Governor's Budget. These grants have been utilized:

(a) For payment of interest and redemption of outstanding bonds issued for Junior College purposes or for loans from the County School Service Fund for Capital Outlay purposes.

(b) For purchase or improvement of junior college sites or the planning or construction for Junior College buildings on a matching basis not to exceed 1 part State funds for 4 parts district funds.[10]

Subsequently, at meetings of February 24 and June 27, 1962, the Coordinating Council adopted resolutions urging the State authorities to submit a bond issue proposal supporting the capital outlay needs of the University of California, the California State Colleges and the public Junior Colleges. Such an issue was submitted at the June 1962 primary election as Proposition 3 which was defeated. However, a revised Proposition 1-A was endorsed by the voters at the November 1962 election. With respect to Junior Colleges the major difference in the two measures was that Proposition 3 stated that the $20 million for Junior Colleges would be used "for expenditure for major building construction, equipment and site acquisition . . . and for the payment of interest and redemption of outstanding bonds of a school district of a city and county issued for junior college capital outlay purposes." Proposition 1-A stated that the bond proceeds shall be used *only* for "building construction, equipment and site acquisition needs" and that at least $20 million shall be used only for these purposes for public Junior Colleges.

In discussions and considerations leading up to inclusion of the Junior Colleges in the State bond proposals recognition was given to the need for developing a sound program for allocation of such funds to the Junior Colleges.[11] The Governor in his Budget message of 1962–63 indicated that the Coordinating Council was studying and would advise on this very complex problem of financing Junior College facilities cooperatively. Accordingly, in April 1962 the Council Director and staff met with representatives of the Departments of Education and of Finance and of the California Junior College Association to determine procedures and relative responsibilities. Following this meeting the Director wrote the Superintendent of Public Instruction:

> It was agreed at that meeting that the Department of Education should be the agency responsible to prepare background material of this subject, as well as specific proposals. The Department should also be responsible for calling together planning committees to work on this subject . . .
>
> I concur wholeheartedly in this decision for I feel the preparation of such a proposal is an administrative matter and one which rightly belongs in the State Department of Education.

This delineation of responsibility is consistent with the provisions of the Donahoe Higher Education Act (*Education Code,* Section 22650), namely, "the public junior colleges shall continue to be a part of the public school system of the State. The State Board of Education shall prescribe minimum standards for the formation and operation of public junior colleges and exercise general supervision over public junior colleges."

On June 27, 1962, after further consultations, the Council staff submitted, and the Council "received as a progress report",[12] the following statement of guidelines for allocation:

> Allocations shall be made only on the basis of an approved project.
>
> Projects shall consist of the planning and construction of instructional areas, the acquisition and improvement of sites, and the acquisition of equipment. No funds will be used for the redemption of bonded indebtedness.
>
> Projects shall not include the planning or construction of dormitories, student centers, stadia, auditoriums, or other areas that are not primarily used for instructional purposes.
>
> Facilities provided through an approved project shall consist of standard facilities planned to

---

[9] *Master Plan,* p. 14.

[10] *State of California Budget . . . 1963–64,* p. 969.

[11] Senate Fact Finding Committee on Education Subcommittee on Higher Education, *Proceedings . . . Junior College Capital Outlay Costs,* Bakersfield, January 16, 1962.

[12] *Minutes,* June 27, 1962, pp. 3–4.

meet the needs of the approved program of the Junior College.

The need for a project shall be based upon (a) a projection of enrollment, and (b) utilization of present facilities and proposed facilities to a standard applicable to other higher education facilities.

Contracts for construction of approved projects shall be approved by the allocating agency with consideration given to cost standards.

At the request of the Council Director, and following passage of Proposition 1-A, discussions at a staff level were initiated by the State Department of Education in a series of meetings beginning December 12, 1962, on a draft of a bill to allocate funds for Junior College capital outlay. A committee was constituted by the State Department. Participating were representatives selected by the California Junior College Association, and staff members of the Department of Education, the Coordinating Council, the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

Prior to these meetings the California Junior College Association on October 31, 1962, approved the following recommendation of its Finance and Legislation Committee namely, "On capital outlay . . . seek distribution of funds . . . on as nearly as possible a one-to-one matching and with inclusion of growth as an element of the formula. . . . Strong opposition is expressed to an 'allocation board' approach."

This recommendation of the Association was transmitted to the above mentioned committee with the note from the Chairman of the Association's Committee on Finance and Legislation that:

> State capital outlay support for junior colleges now is based on a formula whereby the junior college must provide $4 for each $1 the state provides. This works a hardship on many less wealthy junior colleges and should be replaced with a one-to-one matching basis. The existing formula for distribution among junior colleges could be used as a basis for the future but provisions should be added which recognize enrollment increases (growth).

Briefly, it should be noted that the existing Junior College Tax Relief program for capital outlay (*Cal. Stat* 1961, Ch. 1006) establishes an entitlement distribution to all districts based on *existing* resident enrollment (a.d.a.) weighted to reflect an *equalization factor* relating a district's assessed valuation per unit of enrollment to the average assesssed valuation per unit of enrollment for all districts in the state.

In four committee sessions extending to February 1, 1963, all interested parties on the committee endeavored to arrive at a consensus on a means of allocation that could be used as the basis for an on-going or continuing program of State capital outlay support for the Junior Colleges.

Discussion involved all aspects of the problem. While agreement could be reached on some principles or policies it could not be reached on others. Also lack of time to gather and analyze precise system-wide data for Junior Colleges on such key considerations as plant capacity and utilization and enrollment forecasts to a standard applicable to other higher educational facilities, led to realization that only an interim approach to allocation was feasible at that time. In view of the situation as described in the preceding pages the following conclusions were adopted by the Council on April 2, 1963.

1. Certain basic information (particularly plant capacity, plant utilization and reliable enrollment forecasts) required for the development of a long range plan for State assistance to the Junior Colleges is not available; therefore, such procedures that are developed for the distribution of the $20 million from the State Construction Bond Act of 1962 must necessarily be considered as an interim approach.
2. In the development of specific procedures for the distribution of the $20 million now available, the Council views its role as that of proposing guidelines to the Governor, the Legislature, and the State Board of Education for the development of such procedures. Accordingly, the Council offers the following guidelines:
   a. The State Board of Education to be designated as the responsible State authority for the allocation and distribution of such funds.
   b. Allocations to be made only on the basis of a project approved by the local Junior College district governing board and the State Board of Education.
   c. Projects to include the acquisition and improvement of sites, the planning and construction of permanent facilities, and the acquisition of equipment. No fund to be used for redemption of bonded indebtedness.
   d. Projects to exclude the planning or construction of dormitories, student centers (other than cafeterias), stadia, or single purpose auditoriums.
   e. In order to take account of the varying taxable wealth of individual Junior College districts, equalization factors to be applied in the allocation of such funds.
   f. State funds to be allocated only to Junior College districts which have made a minimum qualifying financial effort for capital outlay purposes.

g. State funds to be allocated on a matching basis as an aid and incentive to local districts to provide local instructional facilities.

h. Enrollment growth.

3. Under the provisions of the Donahoe Higher Education Act, the State Board of Education should continue to be responsible for the development of a long-range plan for State assistance for capital outlay to the Junior Colleges.
4. Within the scope of the guidelines shown in number 2, above, the Council staff should continue to cooperate with the appropriate State agencies and Junior College representatives in the development of both the interim and long-range plans for State support to the Junior Colleges for capital outlay purposes.

An interim measure for the distribution of capital outlay funds to the Junior Colleges was established during the 1963 Legislative Session when Chapter 1790, Statutes of 1963 (Senate Bill 1515) was enacted as the "Junior College Facility Construction Law of 1963." The purpose of this act was to specify the distribution of the $20 million for the Junior Colleges contained in the State Construction Bond Act of 1962 (Proposition 1-A).

The interim nature of the act was indicated by Section 2 of the statute which provided as follows:

> SEC. 2. In adopting this act, the Legislature recognizes that it does not constitute a satisfactory means of providing continuing state assistance to junior college districts for the construction of junior college facilities and that its sole purpose is to provide for the allocation of bond funds reserved for junior college construction in Proposition 1-A approved by the electorate in the November 1962 general election.
>
> To the end that a continuing program of assistance to junior college districts for the construction of junior college facilities based upon ability, effort, and need may be developed, the Legislature directs the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, and one representative each selected by the California Junior College Association, the California Junior College Faculty Association, and the California School Boards Association, to study (1) the needs for junior college facilities during the next ten years, (2) the ability of junior college districts to meet the determined need, and (3) the extent to which state assistance is necessary; to formulate plans under which state assistance shall be provided to junior college districts for junior college construction; and to transmit its recommendations, including proposed legislation, to the Legislature on or before the 10th day of the 1965 Regular Sesssion.

The Department of Education acting under the section requested each of the cooperating agencies to name a representative to serve on the committee. The committee as constituted held its first meeting on December 16, 1963, and subsequently met on 14 different occasions.

The report of this committee to the California Legislature prepared pursuant to Senate Bill 1515, and Titled "The Need for Junior College Facilities During the Next Ten Years 1965 to 1975" was filed with the Legislature in January 1965. It outlines the need for Junior College facilities during the ten year period, 1965–1975, the ability of Junior College districts to meet this need, and the extent to which State assistance is necessary. The report concludes with a plan to provide State assistance on a continuing basis for Junior College facilities and a proposed Junior College Construction Act to accomplish this.

Prior to the completion of the work of this committee California voters approved the State Construction Program Bond Act of 1964 on November 3, 1964 (Proposition 2). This Act specified that not less than $50,000,000 of the $380 million provided by the Act was to be for construction purposes of the public colleges. If the report of the committee and the proposed plan for allocating assistance for Junior College facilities is adopted by the Legislature, the $50,000,000 would be distributed through the plan.

The plan to provide State assistance to Junior College districts for capital outlay purposes as formulated by the Committee established for this purpose in S.B. 1515, is in accordance with the policies and principles developed by the Council related to State funding of capital outlay projects for the three segments of public higher education. The plan is also consistent with the guidelines established by the Council for the distribution of State support to the Junior Colleges. The plan:

(1) Provides a continuing program of State assistance to the Junior Colleges for capital outlay purposes.

(2) Provides substantial State support—amounting to one-half of the construction needs of the Junior Colleges.

(3) Recognizes and has built into the enrollment projections upon which the capital outlay needs of the Junior Colleges are based, the diversion of students from the University and State Colleges to the Junior Colleges.

(4) Is based upon enrollment growth and recognizes through built-in equalization factors the varying abilities, effort, and needs of the separate districts supporting Junior Colleges.

(5) Excludes the use of State funds for redemption of existing bonded indebtedness, the planning or construction of dormitories, student centers (other than cafeterias), stadia, single purpose auditoriums, and parking facilities.

In this section we have noted how the operation of California Junior Colleges is now supported and have observed some of the complexities and advantages of the present system. An effort has been made to forecast costs that must be met during the next decade. Methods used in other states and desirable features of a sound support plan have been mentioned. Issues that must be faced in view of the unique position and extent of Junior Colleges in California have been suggested, and several modifications of present support have been touched upon. Concluding has been a discussion of State support programs for capital outlay.

Before presenting findings and conclusions of the Council, it is useful to summarize the statements of experts made at a Council-sponsored seminar in late fall, 1964.

SECTION IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ADVICE TO THE COUNCIL

In November 1964 a number of persons concerned with the Junior Colleges of California met in a Council-sponsored seminar to consider the many aspects of the Junior Colleges. (Participants are listed in the Appendix.) The group, numbering 26 persons and chaired by then Director of the Council, John R. Richards, considered and discussed much of the foregoing material of this report. Following completion of their discussions a series of advisory statements were developed by the participants for use by the staff of the Council, and the Council itself, in preparing final recommendations on the problems affecting the Junior Colleges. These statements, developed with unanimity, reflect the issues discussed and the wide consensus reached by the representatives of the many groups concerned with Junior College education in California who were present at that meeting. The statements are as follows:

JUNIOR COLLEGE OBJECTIVES

1. In continuing their historic role of re-defining what higher education is, California Junior Colleges should reaffirm their goal of serving all who are now legally eligible to enroll.
2. California Junior Colleges, in cooperation with other agencies, should exert leadership in California's efforts to develop programs of education, training, and retraining to meet the special needs of persons unemployed and of those whose employment is threatened by technological or occupational changes.
3. Since the continuing guidance of students with inappropriate goals is a major responsibility of the Junior Colleges, their retention policies should provide opportunity for such readjustment and salvage of students.
4. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with advice of a representative technical committee, should conduct a study to determine whether the Junior Colleges of California should serve a greater share of the freshmen and sophomore students in public higher education than projected by the Master Plan. This study should examine the advisability of establishing experimental relationships between one or two State Colleges or campuses of the University and Junior Colleges serving the area. In these experiments the Junior Colleges would enroll all lower division students.

JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS AND RELATIONSHIP TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

5. All areas of the state of California should be in Junior College districts, and this present intention of the Legislature should be implemented at the earliest possible date.
6. It is desirable that all Junior Colleges be separated promptly from unified or high school districts both in organization and administration. Additional legislation may be necessary to encourage local action.
7. California Junior Colleges should reaffirm their close ties to the public schools while at the same time fulfilling their responsibilities as a segment of public higher education.

GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

8. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with the advice of a representative technical committee, should conduct a comprehensive study of governance of Junior Colleges at the State level, and pending this study no fundamental changes in the present system of Junior College governance at the State level should be made.
9. Pending the outcome of the study by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education of the governance of Junior Colleges, the State Board of Education should reorganize the State Department of Education with the goal of providing leadership and services which will be adequate to meet the needs and responsibilities of the Junior Colleges of the state. Furthermore, the State Board of Education is to be commended for the progress in the study of this needed reorganization and is urged to continue the Arthur D. Little Study.
10. It would be desirable as an interim measure, pending completion of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education study, to strengthen the functions and broaden the membership of the Junior College Committee of the State Board of Education so that it could serve as a consultative body on Junior College matters to the Board.

JUNIOR COLLEGE FINANCE

11. The present Constitutional guarantee of State financial support for Junior Colleges should be maintained.
12. California Junior Colleges should reaffirm the policy of tuition-free Junior College education

for in-state residents, and local boards and the State government should be cautious in establishing fees which discriminate among students.

13. California Junior Colleges should continue to work toward achieving State support of approximately 45% of operating costs as recommended by the Master Plan.
14. The definition of an adult as found in Section 6352 of the *California Education Code* should be eliminated, and State financial support for Junior Colleges should be provided according to the classes offered—graded vs. ungraded—without regard for the category of students enrolled in the classes.
15. Vocational-technical education in California Junior Colleges is the shared responsibility of both State government and local districts. Therefore, the State should continue the same level of support for all graded classes in the Junior Colleges regardless of the programs in which they are offered.
16. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with the advice of a representative technical committee, should study all aspects of Junior College finance.

PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

17. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with advice of a representative technical committee, should study the problems of preparing and certifying all professional personnel for the Junior Colleges of California in order to insure that the colleges are able to attract and utilize competent staff members.

COUNCIL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the sections presented in this report and taking note of the advisory statements immediately preceding, the staff of the Council presented a number of comments and recommendations for consideration by the Council. These were discussed by the Council at its January, Febraury and March, 1965, meetings. Resulting from these discussions recommendations were approved indicating Council judgments. These recommendations are cited below together with relevant comments; observations are also made upon a number of items discussed by the Junior College leaders upon which no recommendations were believed required. As some of the advisory statements relate to other current studies of the Council—such as tuition free education—no comment is made herein.

GOVERNANCE OF LOCAL DISTRICTS

The trend toward autonomous local districts is strong. All new Junior College districts must be governed by separate boards. The Council staff concurs with the following advisory statement of the seminar:

> 6. It is desirable that all Junior Colleges be separated promptly from unified or high school districts both in organization and administration. Additional legislation may be necessary to encourage local action.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council advise the 1965 Legislature to separate all Junior Colleges from unified or high school districts. This action is taken recognizing certain legal considerations in instances of charter cities.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Workpapers, seminar discussions and the seminar's advisory statements reveal some uncertainty about the ways in which higher education differs from secondary education. Uncertainties lead to fears that some unique qualities of Junior Colleges will be lost as they separate from secondary education and enter more fully into higher education. Uncertainties either lead to, or heighten, disagreement between and among faculties and administrators over such questions as faculty senates, credentials, vocational education, and the open door policy.

Precise definition of higher education has not been made nor, because of continuing adaptation to new knowledge and to new social forces, is one likely to be made. Similar forces make a precise definition of secondary education unlikely. Thus, there will continue to be uncertainty about which are the ways in which these two levels of education differ. But there are some obvious and persistent differences which deserve attention.

First, taken as a whole, students in higher education are older and more mature than students in secondary education. College students know more than high school students, have had more extensive experience, are more mature physically and personally.

Second, students in higher education have chosen to attend college in contrast to the compulsory attendance of most high school students. Thus, most college students have goals in view, even though some goals may be unrealistic.

Third, higher education is selective, secondary education is universal. Its selectivity is designed to admit and to retain students who can acquire the knowledge, skill, and ability which it offers.

Fourth, higher education has fewer restraints upon faculty and students than are usually found in secondary education. Greater degrees of freedom exist in faculty choices of what and how to teach, of dress and personal appearance, and of political and social action. Greater degrees of freedom of students are found in the areas of dress, personal appearance, conduct on and off campus, and in political actions. Other examples could be cited. In general, faculty are considered to have the rights and perquisites of an honored profession; students are considered to have and use mature judgment.

The above four areas of difference bear upon specific questions raised in this report and implied in some of the seminar's advisory statements. The following comments point to these relations.

Credentials. Colleges and universities have long recognized the need for quality in faculty, student services, and administration but they have not chosen the device of state licenses or credentials to reach this goal; rather they have selected the voluntary accrediting association.

The Western Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools brings together a team of experts who visit a Junior College and determine whether or not it meets the Association's standards of quality. The education, experience and assignment of personnel occupy important places in these standards. The voluntary association's power to accredit a college is a potent force toward quality in personnel practices. The presence of credential requirements adds nothing to Junior Colleges beyond what is achieved by accreditation. To the contrary, relying upon credentials rather than upon the professional judgments of accrediting teams continues to stamp Junior Colleges as secondary rather than higher education.

The following advisory statement of the seminar deserves attention here.

> 17. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with the advice of a representative technical committee, should study the problems of preparing and certifying all professional personnel for the Junior Colleges of California in order to insure that the colleges are able to attract and utilize competent staff members.

The trend in certification requirements in California and elsewhere is toward fewer and broader requirements. Contributing to and reinforcing these developments are improved programs of preparation, greater local concern for quality, higher personal qualifications of potential educators, and a deepening sense of professional responsibility at all levels of practice.

The Council has directed its staff to continue study of the matter of credentials for Junior College faculty and administration recognizing the many significant arguments which may be applied to either position and the extent of change which would be entailed in any major modification in credential requirements as, for example, their elimination as a requirement for administrators.

Vocational Education. Former President Conant of Harvard University, when commenting about the liberal arts, said that one could not consider them apart from the occupations for which they prepared students, especially occupations in business and industry. His remarks pointed up the long known fact that higher education has always had vocational objectives, and that these have changed specifically to meet changing demands of the world of work.

These demands are changing as rapidly and as dramatically today as at any time in the past. The electronic revolution can be compared with that produced by steam, by the assembly line, or by electric power. Junior Colleges, as a part of higher education, will play important roles in meeting new demands for workers. The following advisory statement from the seminar is a valid point.

> 2. California Junior Colleges, in cooperation with other agencies, should exert leadership in California efforts to develop programs of education, training, and retraining to meet the special needs of persons unemployed and of those whose employment is threatened by technological or occupational changes.

However, the danger of overlap with programs in adult education offered by high schools and with programs offered in extension by the State Colleges and the University and with other State and federal programs is ever present. The State Committee on Continuing Education [1] could study problems in this area.

RECOMMENDATION

The State Committee on Continuing Education be directed to study and report periodically to the Council concerning problems of overlap in programs of retraining or in other vocational programs offered in continuing education.

Vocational education encompasses much more than retraining, it includes an enormous number and variety of occupational programs. Any one of these could become part of higher education when students to be served by it were characterized by mature qualities, when standards unique to the occupation were used to retain students in the program, and when students whose goals are inappropriate for the program were guided away from or out of it. Junior Colleges should include an increasing number of vocational programs in their offerings.

The Open Door Policy. The Master Plan for Higher Education recommends that the California State Colleges admit students from the top one-third of all California graduates and that the University of California admit students from the top one-eighth. These high standards are possible only when students in the lower two-thirds have the alternative route into higher education which is provided by the open door policy of junior colleges.

---

[1] An inter-segmental Committee established under Council auspices in 1963 to coordinate continuing education programs.

No tests have yet been devised which measure students' ability to do college work successfully with the same degree of accuracy found in the test of actual performance in college. The open door policy provides the test of performance for mature students. The following questions are significant: Are the best interests of society and of the individual served by excluding any applicants who may discover the hard way that they are capable of doing college work? Could a great waste of student talent and tax money be prevented by encouraging mature students to attempt the work offered and to remove deficiencies through remedial work? The seminar group advises:

1. In continuing their historic role of re-defining what higher education is, California Junior Colleges should reaffirm their goal of serving all who are now legally eligible to enroll.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council endorse the Junior College goal of serving all who are now legally eligible to enroll.

The question of probation standards is separated here from the question of dismissal policy in order to comment about each and to point out desirable and undesirable relationships. Probation is not punitive, when properly conceived; rather it is a way of bringing a student to the attention of those on the faculty who can help him best. A student on probation is assisted by counselors, psychometrists, advisors, and other specialists. Here the Junior College performs one of its most important educational services.

But some practices in some Junior Colleges do not fit the above ideal. First, the use of a lower probation standard for students in vocational-technical programs than is used for students in transfer programs discriminates against the former group. For example, if a student in a transfer program with a grade point average below 2.00 is placed on probation while a student in a vocational program is placed on probation with a g.p.a. below 1.5, all students in the latter program with g.p.a.'s below 2.00 but above 1.50 are not receiving services which transfer students with similar g.p.a.'s are receiving. Denial of services to such students cannot be defended successfully.

Second, the practice of placing entering students on probation is commendable where it is designed to provide needed services to them and so to help them perform successfully. However, when instant probation is used as a step toward early dismissal, it cannot be commended. Probation so used becomes punitive and so loses its essential character.

Retention in an institution of higher education rests upon the student's demonstrated ability to acquire the knowledge, skill, and ability offered in the programs in which he is enrolled. In comments made above in respect to vocational-technical education, it is suggested that standards unique to the occupation should be used to retain students. The same concept can be applied throughout a junior college, including transfer and remedial programs. When a student is meeting standards unique to a remedial program, he should continue in college. When he cannot meet standards unique to this or any other program, he should not continue. But in any event, he should be allowed sufficient time to test himself against the standards of more than one program before he is dismissed.

In the light of the above comments, and with the interpretations which they imply, the following advisory statement should be accepted.

3. Since the continuing guidance of students with inappropriate goals is a major responsibility of the Junior Colleges, their retention policies should provide opportunity for such readjustment and salvage of students.

SUPPORT OF CURRENT OPERATIONS

All of the financing proposals suggested in Section III, except that related to eliminating basic aid, would increase the percentage of State support. The elimination of the definition of adults would bring State support to approximately 38% of the estimated current expense of education in 1965–66. Lowering the computational tax from 25¢ to 20¢ would bring State support to about 36% and the combination of the two would bring State support to a little more than 46%.

The proposal to eliminate that section of the *Education Code* which defines an adult has great merit as this is a move toward providing State support to the Junior Colleges on the basis of the cost of classes attended by Junior College students rather than on the basis of the age of the student without regard to the cost of the classes he attends. These proposals would shift the in-district adult a.d.a derived from attendance in graded classes to that part of the foundation program which provides support at the rate of $600 per unit of a.d.a. The remaining adult in-district a.d.a. would continue to be supported through that part of the foundation program which provides support at a lower rate per unit of a.d.a.

The in-district a.d.a. derived from the attendance of students in graded classes would therefore be supported at a unit rate—somewhat greater than the $581 actual unit cost of graded classes in 1963–64. The in-district a.d.a. derived from the attendance of students in non-graded classes, however, would be supported at a unit rate somewhat smaller than the $421 actual unit cost of non-graded classes in 1963–64.

Furthermore, any discussion of Junior College finance clearly indicates the complexity of the current support program for the Junior Colleges and the confusion that surrounds it. The program is difficult to understand and to explain, its advantages are far outweighed by its disadvantages, and the program bases support upon the age of the students rather than upon the type and cost of the class the students attend. Further, it is not possible through the program to provide fully equalized educational opportunity to those who attend the Junior Colleges nor fully equalized educational costs to those who support the Junior Colleges.

The study and development of alternate support programs requires the resolution of many difficult and complex issues. For example, one advisory statement of the seminar states:

> 11. The present constitutional guarantee of State financial support for Junior Colleges should be maintained.

This guaranteed State support is provided through "basic aid" to each district maintaining a Junior College regardless of the financial need of the district. Because of this provision, efforts to eliminate "basic aid"—and therefore the present constitutional guarantee of State support have been made in the past. If the present Constitutional guarantee of State financial support for Junior Colleges is in jeopardy because it is provided to each district regardless of the need of that district for State aid, it would seem reasonable to eliminate basic aid to each district if this would assure the continuation of guaranteed State support for the overall Junior College program. Because of issues such as this the seminar stated:

> 16. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with the advice of a representative technical committee, should study the means of financing Junior Colleges.

RECOMMENDATION

A representative technical committee be established to advise the staff in a study in depth of the financing of the Junior Colleges through the current support program and alternate programs and report back to the Council prior to the 1967 session of the Legislature.

It would seem advisable to await the result of the study recommended above before recommending alternative support programs. This does not mean, however, that adjustments in the current program should not be made prior to completion of such study if these adjustments improve and simplify the program.

Some adjustment is necessary if the program is to supply sufficient State funds to bring the percentage of State support closer to the 36% which theoretically should be reached in 1965–66 under Master Plan provisions. Such an adjustment would be in accord with the following advisory statement of the seminar:

> 13. California Junior Colleges should continue to work toward achieving State support of approximately 45% of operating costs as recommended by the Master Plan.

Another advisory statement recommends an adjustment that would, in 1965–66, increase the percentage of State support of the operational expenditures of Junior Colleges to approximately 37%:

> 14. The definition of adults as found in Section 6352 of the *California Education Code* should be eliminated, and State financial support for Junior Colleges should be provided according to the classes offered—graded vs. ungraded—without regard to the category of students enrolled in the classes.

The adjustment would have the additional, and more important, merit of providing State support on the basis of the cost of classes attended by Junior College students rather than on the basis of the age of a student without regard to the cost of the classes he attends. Foundation amounts would have to be established for graded and ungraded classes—amounts that would be determined on the basis of statewide costs of these two types of classes. And further, the adjustment not only has the support of the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and the California Junior College Association, but would firmly establish another advisory statement of the seminar:

> 15. Vocational-technical education in California Junior Colleges is the shared responsibility of both State government and local districts. Therefore, the State should continue the same level of support for all graded classes in the Junior Colleges regardless of the program in which they are offered.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council advise the 1965 Legislature that the definition of an adult, as found in Section 6352 of the *Education Code*, be eliminated and State financial support for the Junior Colleges be provided according to graded and ungraded classes rather than upon the category of students enrolled in the classes.

SUPPORT FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

The plan to provide State assistance to districts maintaining Junior Colleges for capital outlay purposes as formulated by the Committee established for this purpose in SB 1515 (1963) is in accordance with the policies and principles developed by the Council for State funding of capital outlay projects of the three segments of public higher education.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council support the proposed Junior College Construction Act developed by the committee established under the provisions of Section 2, Chapter 1790, Statutes of 1963 (Senate Bill 1515) as submitted by the State Department of Education to the Legislature on January 11, 1965.

DIVERSION OF LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS TO JUNIOR COLLEGES

The seminar developed the following advisory statement:

> 4. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with advice of a representative technical committee, should conduct a study to determine whether the Junior Colleges of California should serve a greater share of the freshmen and sophomore students in public higher education than projected by the Master Plan. This study should examine the advisability of establishing experimental relationships between one or two State Colleges or campuses of the University and Junior Colleges serving the area. In these experiments the Junior Colleges would enroll all lower division students.

The first sentence in the statement calls for a study which may not be timely. Currently the Council staff with the advice of a technical committee is endeavoring, with little success, to discover valid measures of determining how many students have been diverted to Junior Colleges. In addition, the California Public Higher Education Cost and Statistical Analysis, when completed, will include data on enrollments and costs of instruction in lower divisions of all public segments not now available. When both current studies are completed, the desirability of the proposed study can be reviewed.

The second sentence proposes experimentation with an arrangement directly contrary to a Master Plan recommendation that the California State Colleges and the University of California offer lower division programs where there is adequate Junior College coverage. It is suggested that the Council not initiate experiments called for in the advisory statement. If such experimentation seems desirable to the governing boards of the segments in regard to particular State Colleges or University campuses, establishing them is clearly within their current authority. Any such plans should be reported to the Council for comment and advice since they will be inter-segmental in character.

UNIVERSAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTING

The seminar developed the following advisory statement:

> 5. All areas of the State of Claifornia should be in Junior College districts, and this present intention of the Legislature should be implemented at the earliest possible date.

Two isssues deserve attention. First, the usual concept of the community college involves a close relationship between the people and the institution. When sparsely populated areas of the state are included in Junior College districts, some potential students may reside as much as 200 miles from the college. Serving them adequately will require expanding the concept to the providing for a community of students by building residence halls at some Junior Colleges.

Second, some areas of the state escape taxes to support Junior Colleges by remaining out of Junior College districts. The State has committed itself to Junior College education sufficiently to warrant action which will require all areas of the state to be taxed for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council advise the 1965 Legislature that all areas of the state be placed immediately in Junior College districts and that sparsely populated districts be encouraged to provide residence halls for students.

GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES AT THE STATE LEVEL

The seminar adopted the three following comments relating to the governance of Junior Colleges at the State level:

> 8. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with the advice of a representative technical committee, should conduct a comprehensive study of governance of Junior Colleges at the State level, and pending this study no fundamental changes in the present system of Junior College governance at the State level should be made.
>
> 9. Pending the outcome of the study by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education of the governance of Junior Colleges, the State Board of Education should reorganize the State Department of Education with the goal of providing leadership and services which will be adequate to meet the needs and responsibilities of the Junior Colleges of the state. Furthermore, the State Board of Education is to be commended for the progress in the study of this needed reorganization and is urged to continue the Arthur D. Little Study.
>
> 10. It would be desirable as an interim measure, pending completion of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education study, to strengthen the functions and broaden the membership of the Junior College Committee of the State Board of Education so that it could serve

as a consultative body on Junior College matters to the Board.

Section II of this report presented six assumptions with a criterion derived from each. From them are developed these four generalized applications to the California situation:

(1) There should and undoubtedly will be increasing coordination and planning at the State level for Junior Colleges in California.

(2) Just as there can be a balance between State aid and local control, so should it be possible to have local support with some State control.

(3) Whatever the type and nature of the State agency, it should not destroy the integrity and personality of the local institution.

(4) The State agency must have sufficient interest in, and time to devote to, Junior College matters so that the welfare of these institutions is paramount. The services which the staff of such an agency renders to individual institutions and for the system are as important as the coordination function.

The issues to be resolved in choices of an agency for State governance of Junior Colleges lie in the field of public policy. Choices depend more upon values and expectations than upon any data discovered through extensive research. Based upon the guidelines of the six criteria shown earlier and the four generalizations listed above, the following points may be cited stating the advantages of creating a separate board for the governance of the Junior Colleges:

(1) To improve and facilitate the corrdination of Junior Colleges with other segments of higher education, particularly in the area of curriculum articulation.

(2) To provide increased and improved leadership and representation devoted solely to the interests of the Junior Colleges.

(3) To improve and facilitate the coordination and regional development of Junior Colleges and their programs, among both existing colleges as well as new ones which will be created.

(4) To systematically and continually collect information on a uniform basis that can be used for short and long range planning.

(5) To improve the means of establishing and assuring the creation of realistic statewide minimum standards.

(6) To provide the Junior Colleges with unique and experienced professional Junior College leadership selected by the Board.

(7) To provide a board and staff to plan for the continued orderly growth and development of the Junior Colleges.

(8) To provide greater information and services to individual Junior Colleges.

(9) To coordinate the activities of the State and Federal agencies and programs which have impact upon Junior Colleges.

Alternative systems to creation of a central board for statewide governance range from the status quo to modification of the current system by provision for advisory committees to the State Board of Education, reorganization of the State Department of Education toward centralizing services, or expansion of the Department's emphasis on the Junior Colleges. The following, in the belief alternatives have been adequately explored elsewhere, concentrates on possible patterns for creation of a statewide governing board whose function is exclusively the Junior Colleges. In all such proposals it is assumed that local governing boards would continue to function.

Proposal of the Legislative Analyst. The Legislative Analyst in an appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education in December 1964 suggested that a statewide governing board would be desirable. He stated:

> A State Board for the Community Colleges should be created which would be composed of 11–13 members appointed by the Governor with a majority drawn from the public, but some representation from local districts. This board would assume all powers and duties now assigned to the State Board of Education, plus clearly stated responsibility for guiding the development of the Junior Colleges in the area of:
>
> 1. Student admission and retention standards
> 2. Academic planning
> 3. Facility planning and utilization
> 4. District organization
> 5. Faculty standards
> 6. Financial management with respect to both current expense and capital outlay.

Proposed Legislation. Assembly Bill 246, 1965 Session, would provide for a Board of Trustees of the California Junior Colleges composed of ten members appointed for four-year staggered terms by the Governor together with ex-officio members including the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President of the State Board of Education, the Chancellor of the California State Colleges, the President of the University of California and the Speaker of the California State Assembly. The Trustees would succeed to the powers and duties of the State Board of Education, the Superintendent and the Department of Education insofar as the Junior Colleges are concerned.

Senate Bill 779 would create a State Board of Community Colleges consisting of 10 members appointed by the Governor—five representing the general public, and five selected from among the members of local Junior College governing boards. (Local board members would resign their position on appointment to the statewide board.) All members would serve for four-year terms. The Board would succeed to the powers and duties of the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent and the Department of Education. The Board under the statute might:

(a) Make long-range plans for the orderly growth and development of Junior Colleges.

(b) Recommend to the Legislature necessary changes in the law, and to the appropriate agency necessary changes in administrative regulation.

(c) Improve the coordination of the Junior Colleges with other segments of higher education, particularly in the areas of curriculum duplication and transfer procedures.

(d) Coordinate appropriate regional development of Junior Colleges and their programs.

(e) Coordinate and improve the establishment of statewide minimum standards, in particular those pertaining to student admission and retention, and facility planning and utilization.

(f) Provide greater information and services to individual Junior Colleges in order to prevent unnecessary duplication.

(g) Coordinate and, wherever possible, supervise the activities of State and Federal agencies and programs which affect Junior Colleges.

(h) Assure that the functions of the Junior Colleges as set forth in the Donahoe Higher Education Act are being performed.

(i) Develop financial management guidelines with respect to both operating expenses and capital outlay.

(j) Recommend to the Governor, and to the Legislature the amount for appropriate financial support for the Junior Colleges.

Two members of the Board would serve on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education as would the Board-appointed executive director.

Other Models. Other patterns for board composition and function might be considered. The following are suggested "models".

Model A

A State Board for the California Public Junior Colleges composed of twelve members appointed by the Governor for four-year staggered terms. Six of these members must be trustees of local Junior College districts. They would resign their local trusteeship upon appointment by the Governor to the State Board.

The Board would assume all duties, functions and powers presently held with respect to the Junior Colleges by the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In addition the Board shall have the specific responsibility for long-range planning for the growth and development of the Junior Colleges.

The functions and duties of the Junior Colleges as assigned by the Donahoe Higher Education Act and related statutes would remain in effect. In no way would the present powers, duties and functions legally assigned to local boards of trustees be changed or impaired.

The Board shall have the power to appoint a Chief Executive Officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. This Chief Executive Officer shall be responsible for appointing all necessary staff. The Chief Executive Officer and two members of the Board shall serve as Junior College representatives on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

Model B

A State Board for the California Public Junior Colleges composed of ten members appointed by the Governor for four-year staggered terms. The Board shall, by majority vote, elect a President and Vice-President of the Board who shall serve for a two-year term.

The Board shall assume all powers, duties and functions with respect to the Junior Colleges presently vested in the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Department of Education. Among these responsibilities, the Board shall have specific responsibilities for:

(1) long-range planning for the continued orderly growth and development of Junior Colleges

(2) recommending necessary changes in current statutes and administrative regulations pertaining to the Junior Colleges

(3) improving coordinating of the Junior Colleges with other segments of higher education, particularly in the area of curriculum articulation

(4) coordinating regional development wherever possible of Junior Colleges and their programs

(5) systematically and continually collecting information on a uniform basis that can be used for short and long-range planning

(6) coordinating and improving the creation of realistic statewide minimum standards

(7) providing greater information and services to individual Junior Colleges in order to prevent unnecessary duplication and at the same time present educational innovations possibly not available to a local district

(8) coordinate and supervise the activities of State and Federal agencies and programs which have impact upon Junior Colleges

(9) assuring that the functions of the Junior Colleges as set forth in the Donahoe Higher Education Act are being performed.

All present powers, duties and functions now enjoyed by local governing boards of Junior Colleges shall be retained.

The Board shall appoint a Director of Junior Colleges who shall be responsible for appointment of a staff necessary to carry out the duties assigned to the Board and its staff.

The Board shall also appoint, by majority vote, an Advisory Committee on Junior Colleges to be composed of twelve members to serve for three-year terms as follows:

4 local college trustees
4 local college administrators
4 local college faculty members

The Director of Junior Colleges shall serve as chairman. The Board of Governors shall not act finally upon any major matter affecting the Junior Colleges without first submitting it to, and receiving the advice from this advisory committee. The Board may appoint other committees as it deems necessary.

Model C

A State Coordinating Council for Public Junior Colleges is established, composed of eight trustees appointed from local school boards maintaining Junior Colleges and four members appointed from the general public. All appointments are to be made by the Governor for four-year staggered terms. Trustees appointed from local school boards would resign their local positions upon appointment to the State Council.

The State Coordinating Council for Public Junior Colleges shall assume all powers, duties and functions with respect to the Junior Colleges now vested in the State Board of Education, the State Superinendent of Public Instruction and the State Department of Education.

The most important function to be performed by the State Council, in addition to those already included, will be those that deal with, and facilitate, coordination, articulation and regional planning. Adequate presentation of statewide needs of the Junior Colleges is essential.

The Council is authorized to appoint a Chief Executive Officer and other necessary staff. All staff now dealing with the Junior Colleges currently employed in the State Department of Education shall be transferred to the staff of the new Council.

The Council, following extensive discussion of the general subject of Junior College governance directed further study of the subject in the resolution following, approved March 30, 1965.

RECOMMENDATION

WHEREAS, Enrollments in California Junior Colleges will increase dramatically from the 152,401 full-time students in the Fall, 1964, to 300,450 by 1980, and the number of Junior Colleges is projected to increase from the current 74 campuses to over 100 by 1980; and

WHEREAS, The need to provide more statewide staff assistance and services for Junior Colleges is already becoming increasingly necessary, and there is an urgent and increasing need for leadership at the State level devoted solely to the problems, interests and development of the Junior Colleges; and now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in recognition of the major role of the Junior Colleges in public higher education in California, states that it believes the ultimate establishment of a statewide board devoted exclusively to the Junior Colleges may be essential to the future orderly growth and development not only of the Junior Colleges, but to all of California higher education; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the staff of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education is directed to immediately begin an intensive study of:

1. **The data pertaining to the advisability of the establishment of a State Board for the Junior Colleges, and**
2. **The composition, duties, powers and responsibilities of such a board, and**
3. **The statutory and fiscal implications involved in such a change of governance, and**
4. **The means for insuring that such a change will not endanger the present system of joint local-state governance, and be it further**

RESOLVED, That results of this study be reported to the Council no later than October 1966, so that the Council may appropriately advise the 1967 session of the Legislature.

APPENDIX

PARTICIPANTS, SEMINAR ON ISSUES AFFECTING THE JUNIOR COLLEGES NOVEMBER 15–17, 1964—PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

Working Papers Prepared by:

Dr. Jon Lombardi, President, Los Angeles City College
Dr. Leland L. Medsker, Vice-Chairman, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley
Dr. Dale Tillery, University of California, Berkeley
Dr. Henry T. Tyler, Executive Secretary, California Junior College Association

Participants

Dr. Julio L. Bortolazzo, President, College of San Mateo
Mr. Thomas Braden, State Board of Education
Dr. Algeo H. Brill, Assistant Superintendent and Vice President Yuba College, Marysville
Dr. Reed L. Buffington, President, Chabot College
Dr. Gilbert A. Collyer, President, Shasta College
Mr. Walter Coultas, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Colleges and Adult Education, Los Angeles City Junior College District
Mrs. Elizabeth M. Deedy, Board of Trustees, College of Marin
Dr. Calvin C. Flint, President, Foothill College
Mr. John H. Given, California Junior College Association, San Juan Capistrano
Mr. Frederic W. Hile, Higher Education Executive, California Teachers Association
Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Education, UCLA
Dr. Paul F. Lawrence, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dr. Stuart E. Marsee, President, El Camino College
Dr. Daniel B. Milliken, President, Chaffey College
Dr. Randolph Newman, President, Santa Rosa Junior College
Dr. Ralph Prator, President, San Fernando Valley State College
Alice M. Rose, Chairman, Junior College Coordinating Council, California Federation of Teachers
Dr. Edward Simonsen, President, Bakersfield College
Mr. William P. Smith, Jr., California Junior College Faculty Association
Dr. Robert E. Swenson, President, Cabrillo College
Dr. James Thornton, Jr., San Jose State College
Dr. Emil O. Toews, Chief, Bureau of Junior College Education

TABLE I

Junior College "Tuition Tax" by Counties—1959-60 to 1963-64 (per $100 of Assessed Valuation)

County	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60	County	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60
Alameda	$0.3760	$0.3637	$0.3360	$0.2996	$0.2963	Orange	.5148	.4607	.4471	.3970	.3623
Alpine	—	—	—	—	—	Placer	—	—	—	—	—
Amador	.0970	.1100	.1225	.0900	.0930	Plumas	.0910	.0850	.0560	.0521	.0390
Butte	.2070	.1430	.1360	.1330	.0950	Riverside	.3001	.3196	.2320	.2700	.2180
Calaveras	.300	.1500	.1700	.1400	.1500	Sacramento	.2500	.0600	.0600	.1800	—
Colusa	.1200	.1700	.1700	.1300	.1200	San Benito	—	.0031	—	—	—
Contra Costa	—	.1800	—	—	—	San Bernardino	.3660	.3200	.2530	.2250	.2300
Del Norte	.0750	.0670	.0810	.0670	.0690	San Diego	.3110	.0660	.2730	.2400	.2400
El Dorado	.1300	.1284	.1284	.1300	.1600	San Francisco	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	.2500	.2450	.2400	.2200	.1907	San Joaquin	.3960	.4060	.3520	.3040	.3180
Glenn	.0850	.0800	.0610	.0460	.0250	San Luis Obispo	.1500	.1500	.1100	.1100	.1100
Humboldt	.0670	.0650	.0590	.0340	.0300	San Mateo	.3730	.1583	.1635	.2548	.2604
Imperial	.3780	.0600	—	—	.1940	Santa Barbara	.2000	.2100	.2500	.1500	.1100
Inyo	.1181	.0866	.0600	.0802	.1179	Santa Clara	.3330	.3410	.2730	.2350	.2090
Kern	.2400	.2600	.2200	.2400	.1500	Santa Cruz	.0430	.1840	.0350	—	—
Kings	.3625	.3500	.3500	.3050	.2950	Shasta	.2700	.2900	.2300	.2200	.2100
Lake	.1200	.1400	.1300	.1300	.1000	Sierra	.2280	.2400	.1480	.1038	.1150
Lassen	.2800	.1500	.2800	.0400	.1800	Siskiyou	.3300	.2300	.3200	—	.0800
Los Angeles	.4890	.4324	.4314	.3699	.3820	Solano	.2000	.1800	.1700	.1300	.1300
Madera	.2150	.2350	.1910	.1910	.1730	Sonoma	.3900	.4000	.3700	.3100	—
Marin	.0600	.2600	.3100	.2400	.2100	Stanislaus	.6000	.5400	.5700	.4100	.4200
Mariposa	.1100	.1700	.1500	.1630	.1390	Sutter	.3500	.3900	.3700	.3200	.3900
Mendocino	.2300	.2100	.1800	.1600	.1300	Tehama	.2400	[illegible]	.2000	.1600	.1600
Merced	.3800	.2500	.2600	.2000	.2000	Trinity	.3500	[illegible]	.2000	.1000	.1100
Modoc	.0825	.0833	.0596	.0534	.0635	Tulare	.4300	[illegible]	.4400	.3600	.3200
Mono	.0400	.0400	.0200	.0100	—	Tuolumne	.2500	[illegible]	.3000	.2100	.2000
Monterey	—	—	.5900	.5100	—	Ventura	—	[illegible]	.3500	.3500	.3700
Napa	.2600	.2000	.2700	.2000	.1800	Yolo	.1900		.1500	.1400	.2200
Nevada	—	.1200	.5400	.4600	.4700	Yuba	—	—	—	—	—

NOTE: Blanks usually indicate that there is no non-district territory in the county [illegible] a few instances—e.g., Alpine—they [illegible] m the county attended a junior college.

SOURCE: Bureau of Apportionments and Records, State Department of Education.

TABLE II

Assessed Valuation Per Resident Non-adult Unit of ADA All Junior Colleges, 1961-62 and 1963-64

COUNTY District	1961-62 AV/Res. Non-Adult ADA (dollars)	1963-64 AV/Res. Non-Adult ADA (dollars)
ALAMEDA		
Oakland	185,300	171,200
South County	220,500	229,579
CONTRA COSTA		
Contra Costa	239,000	188,846
FRESNO		
Coalinga	640,000	626,481
Fresno	144,800	132,136
Reedley	79,200	91,524
IMPERIAL		
Imperial	267,000	188,504
KERN		
Kern	172,800	178,515
West Kern	282,000	340,107
LASSEN		
Lassen	127,800	92,929
LOS ANGELES		
Antelope Valley	217,500	138,677
Cerritos	145,000	131,636
Citrus	106,800	94,908
Compton	136,000	130,301
El Camino	164,800	155,106
Glendale	118,200	108,754
Long Beach	150,200	122,640
Los Angeles	226,100	221,266
Mt. San Antonio	164,000	167,634
Pasadena	87,500	88,129
Rio Hondo	150,000	146,879
Santa Monica	116,700	112,615
MARIN		
Marin	204,000	186,351
MERCED		
Merced	—	193,039
MONTEREY		
Hartnell	198,000	150,354
Monterey Peninsula	101,400	80,699
NAPA		
Napa	131,400	89,220
ORANGE		
Fullerton	122,000	114,676
Orange Coast	183,000	147,569
Santa Ana	156,300	152,703
PLACER		
Sierra	178,600	181,127
RIVERSIDE		
Coachella	1,120,000	490,468
Mt. San Jacinto	—	339,933
Palo Verde	177,000	216,385
Riverside	114,000	98,163
SACRAMENTO		
American River	165,000	140,698
Sacramento	134,400	125,619
SAN BERNARDINO		
Barstow	404,000	385,716
Chaffey	154,500	162,523
San Bernardino Valley	130,600	108,492
Victor Valley	475,000	337,115
SAN DIEGO		
Grossmont	232,000	168,418
Oceanside-Carlsbad	139,500	160.824
Palomar	170,000	142,962
San Diego	250,000	184,559
Sweetwater	212,000	153,446
SAN FRANCISCO		
San Francisco	244,000	235,041
SAN JOAQUIN		
San Joaquin Delta	106,000	137,473
SAN MATEO		
San Mateo	229,000	167,995
SANTA BARBARA		
Santa Barbara	200,000	182,505
Santa Maria	418,000	319,214
SANTA CLARA		
Foothill	244,000	166,882
Gavilan	602,000	267,620
San Jose	185,000	223,937
West Valley	—	179,177
SANTA CRUZ		
Cabrillo	205,600	143,884
SHASTA		
Shasta	114,000	114,616
SISKIYOU		
Siskiyou	214,000	200,942
SOLANO		
Vallejo	86,000	52,066
SONOMA		
Santa Rosa	115,300	149,478
TULARE		
Porterville	156,000	145,894
Sequoias	140,300	141,959
VENTURA		
Ventura	214,000	241,355
YUBA		
Yuba	125,000	108,830
State total	$185,000	$170,680

printed in CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING

43891--453 4-65 1,500